PLANNING HISTORY BULLETIN

1984   vol. 6   No. 1

CONTENTS

CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

MEETING AND CONFERENCES

BOOK REVIEWS

ARTICLES

CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

I had hoped to be able to announce in this issue the news that PHG had successfully negotiated an arrangement with an academic publishing house of international reputation whereby a new Journal of Planning History, perhaps called **Planning Perspectives,** would be launched in 1986.   Sadly, news of the birth is still awaited, though with every expectation of a happy and successful delivery.   Hopefully, I shall be able to say more in our next number.

Over the past few years members the world over will have benefitted from the supremely skilfull work of my secretary Sue Ellas.   Not only has she operated with consumate attention to detail as our Membership Secretary, receiving and processing our cheques for the Treasurer and keeping our records up to date, but she has also typed the **Bulletin** for the Editor and got it ready for reproduction and, subsequently, dispatch.   Her skill on the word processor over recent issues has given us an attractive publication for our shelves.   Sue has now moved in the University to another post on promotion.   This is well deserved and we extend our congratulations; but we also extend our many thanks for dedicated, beautifully executed work over the years.   The Planning History Group owes much to Sue and we are immensely grateful for her constant interest and support.   The Editor joins me in saying 'thank you' - simple, but heart felt words.

To hold the fort somewhat I am just about coping with the Membership Secretary's duties.   More important, I am happy to let you know that the production of the **Bulletin** is now in the very capable hands of two other University secretaries, Sue Kennedy and Linda Williamson.   We welcome them to our team.

On behalf of the Treasurer I would urge all those who have not yet paid their 1984 subscription to do so please without delay.   If you have not paid, you will find a payments slip with this issue, as a reminder; if you have paid there will be no such slip.

Meetings continue to be held in various countries.   Let me give another 'plug' to the Green Towns and Cities Conference in Liverpool in July; a leaflet is enclosed.   As an advance notice, please note that arrangements are being considered for an International PHG Conference in Chicago; Marc Weiss of the School of Planning and Policy at the University of Illinois in Chicago has this in hand and we look forward to hearing from him with further details.

The term of office for the following members of the Executive will come to an end in August 1984:

Mr. P. A. Booth (Treasurer)

Professor G. E. Cherry (Chairman)

Dr. A. D. King

Dr. Helen Meller

Dr. J. Sheail (Editor)

Professor A. R. Sutcliffe
(Meetings Secretary)

Professor J. B. Cullingworth

Professor D. A. Kreukeberg
(Editor for the Americas)

Professor P. Marcuse

Dr. M. Smets

Dr. I. C. Taylor

Dr. S. Watanabe

Professor W. H. Wilson

would those members of the Planning History Group wishing to offer themselves for election to the Executive (or re-election in the case of the names above) please let me have their names in writing not later than 30 June 1984. There are no requirements for proposers or seconders. If there are more than the required numbers of names submitted (six for UK; seven for non-UK) there will be an election by postal ballot, and voting slips will be enclosed in the August number of the **Bulletin**.

Gordon E. Cherry

MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

GREEN TOWNS AND CITIES

Further details of this conference, planned for 10-14 July 1984, are included in this issue of PHB.

NEW YORK CITY HOUSING HISTORY

A Symposium on this theme will be held on 12-13 October 1984 at Columbia University. It will look at the history of housing for the working people and the poor in the period, 1901-1984, from an historical perspective, seeking to clarify the causes for changing housing conditions over the period. The Symposium will focus particularly on the relationship between changing patterns of economic activity and housing conditions, the impact of grass-root organisations, changes in the spatial distribution of housing, and the evolution of city policies.

The sponsors would like to hear from those, both within and outside the US, interested in participating. They would also be interested to learn of those doing similar work, who might like to participate in the planning of an international conference on similar themes, viewed comparatively. For details of the Symposium and future meetings, get in touch with Peter Marcuse, Division of Urban Planning, 410 Avery Hall, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, or Richard Lieberman, F. H. LaGuardia Community College, City University of New York, 31-10 Thomson Avenue, Long Island City, NY 11101.

PAST MEETS PRESENT

The New York Council for Humanities will sponsor a 2 day conference in October 1984, on the theme of visions of the past offered to the public in museum galleries, historic farms, industrial sites, recorded structures and districts. Contributors to the conference will come from the fields of history, folklore, geography, anthropology, archaeology, architecture and historic preservation. For details, write to Jo Blatti, New York Council for the Humanities, 33 West 42 Street, New York, NY 10036.

THE CANADIAN URBAN EXPERIENCE

The Canadian Urban Studies conference will be held in late August 1985 at the University of Winnipeg. Papers are invited on such themes as economic growth and development, government and politics, urban education and research, social structure and action, and the built environment and housing. The overall aim is to promote interdisciplinary and comparative perspectives on Canadian urban topics. The conference will include several tours of Winnipeg and other Manitoba communities. For details, write to Dr. Alan F.J. Aribise, Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg, 515 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3B 2E9.

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND URBAN IMAGERY IN OXFORD

Can structural analysis be applied to urban imagery? Is architectural photography dominated by finance capital? Such are the questions that beset this reporter after the September Planning History Group Conference in Oxford.

There were two primary themes: urban imagery, seen through various types of camera lens; and planning and economic change, filtered through various shades of

marxist analysis. For light relief there were examples of the films discussed and a field excursion to view what might be regarded as historic examples of planned development wrought by economic change in Oxfordshire.

Tony Sutcliffe opened the proceedings with a comment that he had just returned from a Conference in France where there is now considerable criticism of the belief that the development of planning was rooted in economic change. Nevertheless he still held to this traditional view because, for him, it helped explain the origins and formulation of urban policy in Victorian Britain. Having been liberated from the great man theory of history, he had been able to develop a structuralist interest in the growth of cities, and this had helped in his search to understand why planning had been invented and had been adopted by European states at the end of the nineteenth century. Viewing urban change from the perspective of world economics, and in particular the increasing dominance of footloose finance capital before 1914, city government was developed and city planning used to cope with the structural inbalance of the late Victorian city.

This neo-marxist approach pleased some of the audience who welcomed Tony Sutcliffe as a potential convert. It also set the tone for the following papers dealing with housing and industry. Tim Brown claimed that marxist analysis had enabled him to unearth the importance of the Trades Council in the evolution of housing policy in Coventry between 1890 and 1939. This body had provided a pivotal role in the workers' fight for better housing conditions although, from his evidence, it did appear that the spec builders had most impact - being largely responsible for doubling the housing stock between 1925 and 1939.

Chris Bacon attacked the growing belief that council housing was a disaster caused by the espousal of socialist ideas and policies. In a well-researched paper he examined two particular periods - 'homes for heroes' built after the First World War, and 'streets in the sky' built after the Second World War. In both cases he suggested that it was right-wing capitalism that had called the tune with respect to both design and location. The same forces were now encouraging a critique of social housing: the positive ideas of Marx, Engels and William Morris were being negated by the current post-modernist aesthetic.

Steve Ward examined the way various local authorities had used publicity and financial incentives to entice footloose industries to their locality in the period 1900-1939. Local industrial property was affected to a considerable extent by municipal enterprise and local business acumen. Town planning was accorded a minor role and was swept aside when deemed inconvenient. In an analysis of the relationship between the development of I.C.I. at Billingham and the North Tees Town Planning Scheme, in the 1920s, Derek Gunby provided a cogent example of the ability of big business to override the public interest.

Marxist analysis appeared to have less to offer when the Conference discussed imagery as portrayed by films (before 1939) and TV (post 1950s). As John Gold stated, the experience of more than 60 years of mass communication studies demonstrated that the pursuit of cause-and-effect outside the broad matrix of social communication......inevitably leads to research that proves remarkably little. For Conference participants, as for earlier audiences, the pre-war films shown by John Gold were an escape from the work-a-day world. They provided an image of the world we subsequently tried to build. The results are often the subject of TV documentaries, whose making was described and criticised by Jane MacFarlane (1). Tom Picton laid bare the problems of another aspect of image building - architectural photography. In each case, discussion about the film, the documentary, the photograph concentrated as much on the study of an individual and his ideas as on the structure of the society in which he or she worked. The 'great man' theory of

2

history may take a long time to die in part because people seem more interesting than institutions.

A field excursion to 'New Communities in Oxfordshire' offered a chance to judge an individual's deeds in their social and economic context. With the sun shining and David Whitham leading, the excursion to see the remnants of the infamous Cutteslowe Wall, a Chartist village turned ribbon development of bungalows, and a successsion of other attempts at building model communities from different centuries, was judged great fun.

All in all, this was a very successful Conference thanks to the hard work of Steve Ward and the Short Course Unit in the Department of Town Planning at Oxford Polytechnic (2). It succeeded in raising a number of contentious issues about the work of town planning not only before 1939 but now: notably the question of why different groups for different reasons managed to pretend there was agreement about the future when there was quite obviously considerable dissension. It again raised the question of whether personalities are more important than systems in influencing local events.

Town planning may have been one of the first policy-areas to embrace concensus, as Derek Gunby stated, but it appears to be effective only when the big battalions agree. (I would regard this as a reversal of one of its prime objectives - to safeguard little people from exploitation by big people). If concensus is at the heart of its ideology and techniques, as surely it must be, how does town planning cope with change, when change is brought about by a myriad of different decisions which challenge concensus? If the British Government in 1909 believed in fostering economic change through labour mobility, as their home policy suggested, why did they adopt town planning? Was the development of town planning (in Britain) really rooted in economic change, or was it considered a matter of little consequence, in comparison with (for instance) land reform? A debate on this subject may help us understand not only the historic role of town planning better, but also its future purpose.

JOHN MINETT
Oxford Polytechnic.

(1) Jane Macfarlane, (1982) The representation of architecture and architectural history on film and television. **M.Sc. dissertation in 'The history of modern architecture' (unpublished)**, Bartlett School of Architecture & Planning, University College, London.

(2) The papers on Planning and Economic Change will be published by Oxford Polytechnic Department of Town Planning as an Oxford Working Paper.

ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF PLANNING

The 25th annual conference of the Association drew more than 200 attendees to San Franscicso between 21 and 23 October 1983. Of more than 50 separate sessions, 4 were particularly focussed on planning history.

Roger Montgomery of the University of California, Berkeley, chaired a session of the **History of City Planning**. The papers presented were 'The Spread of Planning as a Municipal Institution in the U.S.' by Barbara J. Robins of the University of Wisconsin, Madison: To think "History" in City Planning: A Critical Review by M. Christine Boyer of Columbia; and 'Scientific Boosterism: The Real Industry and the Origins of Local Government Land-Use Regulations in the U.S.' by Marc Weiss of the University of Illinois, Chicago. Peter Marcuse of Columbia was discussant.

3

Planning History was the subject of a session for which Carl V. Patton of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, was both chair and discussant. The papers were 'The Sydney H. Williams Incident: Planning and Politics in Cincinnati During the McCarthy Era' by Laurence C. Gerckens of Ohio State University; 'Planning Education at Illinois – Origins and Ancestors' by Albert Z. Guttenberg and Louis B. Wetmore of the University of Illinois, Urbana; and 'LeClaire: Social Laboratory or Company Town?' by Carl Lossau of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

A session on **Planning Thought** chaired by John Friedmann of the University of California, Los Angeles, offered two papers of an historical nature. One was 'Institutionalist Economics and the Intellectual Origins of Policies Planning in the U.S.' by Martin G. Gellen of the University of California, Berkeley. The other was 'George Orwell and the Dilemma of Western Planning' by Robert A. Beauregard of Rutgers University.

The luncheon address on Saturday was given by Donald A. Krueckenberg of Rutgers University. His paper, Planning and the New Depression in the Social Sciences, examined the growth of planning as a discipline in higher education in the U.S., relative to the social sciences and several allied professions over the past three decades. The luncheon session was chaired by Michael B. Teitz of the University of California, Berkeley, President of ACSP. Commentators were Carl Goldschmidt of Michigan State University and Jack Howard and Larry Susskind, both of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The 26th annual conference is scheduled for New York City in October 1984. Proposals for papers are welcome and should be addressed to Professor David Sawicki, Graduate Program in City Planning, School of Architecture, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, 30332, U.S.A.

DON KRUECKEBERG

BANLIEUE, MUNICIPALITÉS ET RÉFORMISME

Henri Sellier (1883-1943) is hardly a household name in his native France, let alone in this country. Members of the PHG will probably be aware of him, if at all, as the person who imported the ideas of Raymond Unwin into the Paris region after the First World War, with his scheme for a ring of **cités-jardins** around the city (see James Read's excellent article in **Architectural Review**, 976, 1978). They would be surprised, therefore, to find Sellier the subject of a three-day conference held in Paris at the end of November, with no less than 22 scheduled papers.

The venue for the conference was the civic theatre in the **cité-jardins** created by Sellier near Suresnes, in the western suburbs of Paris. Sellier was mayor of Suresnes throughout the interwar period and, while his activities were by no means confined to this one town (he was, for instance, Minister of Health in the 1936 Popular Front government), it was the base and centre of his operations.

The conference was of interest for a number of reasons. For a start, it was interesting to see how far French urban sociology has moved from the theoretical preoccupations of the 1970s. What is now disparagingly termed **'théoreticisme'** is out; concrete historical research, particularly into the development of urban management and planning in the inter-war period, is **in**. Some French participants complained that the counter-theoretical backlash had gone too far, and that what was now in vogue was nothing more than nineteenth-century positivism. It was curious, nonetheless, to find work done in the 1970s in this country on the history of housing

being regaded in Paris with something of the admiration previously accorded in Britain to French work of the theoretical school. This trend within French urban research also meant that at this conference there was less of a gap between French abstraction and British empiricism than is often the case. All could agree on the subject of the meeting : the theory and practice of urban management development by Henri Sellier.

To anyone familiar with Sellier only in his garden-city guise there were two major revelations at the conference. The first was that the Sellier we know – Sellier the admirer of the English garden-city movement – was only a small part of the man. The opening presentation, by Murard and Zylberman, on 'Sellier hygiéniste', began the process of uncovering the real Sellier. They showed that for Sellier city and urban life was a living organism that required medical, and sometimes surgical, attention. Sellier and his cadre of social workers, health visitors, teachers, administrators, planners constituted the 'medical' staff. The paper by Guerrand on 'Sellier et le service social' described the elaborate system of health care at Suresnes, with its emphasis on the education of the population in rational (i.e. healthy) ways of living. Cochard's paper described the incredibly elaborate educational theories implemented at Suresnes – including a Taylorised system of nursery provision!

What this amounted to, of course, was instruction in rational ways of planning and managing everyday life. Rational housing (which is what Sellier took Unwin to represent) was only a small part of this. The paper by the conference organiser, Katherine Burlen, provided the keynote : social science as the basis for the management of the urban population. People should lead their lives in a rational, well-planned way. Not surprisingly, this evidence of Sellier being the promoter of what might be called middle-class ways of living prompted speculation over the whole issue of 'the middle class' and its development...

If the range of Sellier's enterprise was one surprise, another was his centrality in French urban and political history. My previous impression had been that Sellier was, if not exactly a freak, at least something of a one-off. This was incorrect. A crucial paper by Reberioux placed Selier squarely in the tradition of reformist socialism in France. In a masterly review of reformist politics in France in the years before 1914, Reberioux showed how Albert Thomas effected the substitution of class collaboration for class war as the central tenet of French socialism, and how Sellier's thinking was fully in accord with this change. In the myriad of activities and initiatives orchestrated by Thomas in the pre-1914 period, said Reberioux, 'on trouve Sellier un peu partout'. Other papers showed that Sellier's commitment to cooperation between the classes in no way diminished in his later years.

Discussion of Sellier's role as a physical planner was confined to three or four papers. In my own paper, looking at the way in which Unwin was 'read' by Sellier, I argued that in 1919 Sellier derived from Unwin's **Town Planning in Practice** (1909), not just ideas about design, but also his ideas about the role and nature of the cité-jardins. In other words, his conception was that of the Hampstead Garden Suburb rather than the Tudor Walters Report. The paper by Anthony Sutcliffe provided a broader review of the relationship between the English and the French garden-city movements. He pointed out that the term 'cite-jardins' did not mean the same as 'garden city' (cite meaning a district within a town, as well as a city). This, he said, was a deliberate ambiguity on the part of Benoit-Levy, which by semantic means abolished the controversial question of the distinction between 'garden city' and 'garden suburb'.

What none of the papers mentioned was the **other** crucial ingredient in Sellier's thinking about design : the tradition of reforming and improving the urban tenement block, rather than adopting the rural or suburban cottage. At the cité-jardins of

Suresnes (designed in 1919). Sellier married the two : 'improved' Parisian apartment blocks (T-shaped, five storeys) were built on what was otherwise an Unwinite site plan. Arguably, in the long run, it was this urban tradition that proved the more soundly rooted of the two : by the 1930s - to say nothing of the post-1945 period, with its **grands ensembles** - the garden city implant had withered and disappeared.

Despite this quibble, this was clearly a meeting of major consequence - effectively transforming the state of knowledge about the subject. It is important therefore that the papers and discussion (all elaborately microphoned) should be published as quickly as possible.

MARK SWENARION
Bartlett School of Architecture,
University College, London.

BOOK REVIEWS

James Stevens Curl (1983), **The Life and Work of Henry Roberts 1803-76: Architect.** Phillimore, Shopwyke Hall, Chichester, Sussex. £30.00. ISBN O 85033 446 2.

For a decade and more students of nineteenth century urban history have had cause to be grateful to John Tarn for his detailed studies of the housing trusts of the mid-nineteenth century and their gradual merging with the public health and garden city movement to promote town-planning as the approach for the twentieth century. **Five per cent Philanthropy** (1973) presented a grand canvas, as crowded and brimful of detail as any by Frith, that master of the Victorian **genre**. Now, through the exhaustive researches of James Stevens Curl, we can focus on one of the most significant figures of the era, Henry Roberts (1803-76), who was involved with the design of well-publicised housing schemes promoted by the Society For Improving the Conditions of the Labouring Classes (SICLC).

Dr Curl believes that it is a paradox that Roberts has received such scant attention, a man whom he considers to have been a great reformer, a prolific writer, a much sought after lecturer, an associate of Shaftesbury, of the Prince Consort and of other illustrious Victorians, a successful architect with several distinguished buildings to his credit. There is indeed an element of paradox about Robert's life and career. Born in America in 1803 and brought up in comfortable circumstances, he entered the Royal Academy Schools in 1825 and worked in the offices of Charles Fowler and Robert Smirke, both distinguished practioners in the classical style. In 1832 he won the competition for the new Fishmingers Hall on an elevated Thamesside site adjoining the rebuilt London Bridge with an elegant Neo-Grec design that might have bid fair to herald a fashionable career. Yet the building had come to seem outdated by the time it was completed in 1840, a relic of the age of reason in a complex and changing urban environment, increasingly beset by squalor and disease. Some competent, if scarcely inspired, country houses notwithstanding, fruits of Robert's well placed social connections, the Fishmongers Hall represented a **non-sequitor**.

The context for his most characteristic work was provided by the urban problems of the 1830s, and the reform climate, stimulated initially by the Liberal government. As early as 1835 Roberts designed a hostel for destitute sailors, which proved to be a portent for his major works of the 1840s. Roberts also became well acquainted with Ashley-Cooper, later Lord Shaftesbury. In 1844 he became a founder-member and later honorary architect to the SICLC, for whom he designed all their original housing schemes, beginning with model houses and flats at Bagnigge Wells, off Gray's Inn Road, in 1844. It was in 1849 that Roberts designed what Curl evaluates as his

most significant work, the model houses for families at Streatham Street, Bloomsbury. Here 48 families were accommodated in balcony-access flats grouped around three sides of an internal courtyard. Each flat had two bedrooms, a large living room with cooking range and a scullery which acted as a ventilated lobby to the w.c. and represented a considerable advance on prevailing standards in London. Indeed Dr. Curl comments that the internal w.c. was not a universal feature in the pioneer LCC scheme at Bounderry Street in the 1890s. Externally the Streatham Street flats attained a simple dignity with well-proportioned sash windows and banded stock brickwork with stone dressings. Robert's interest in building construction resulted in the use of hollow bricks in shallow concrete vaults to produce a virtually fireproof structure. Inevitably rent levels, from four shillings to seven shillings a week, were relatively high and from its inception the scheme was recognised as catering for the 'artizan and journeyman class'.

In 1851 Roberts and the SICLC were involved with a major publicity **coup**, the construction of Demonstration Cottages for the Great Exhibition, under the patronage of and financed by the Prince Consort. A site opposite the transept of the Crystal Palace itself ensured that the block of four flats for 'families of the classes of manufacturing operatives who reside in towns or their immediate vicinity' were seen by 250,000 visitors, including Queen Victoria herself. The plans gave three bedrooms, a living room, scullery and wc. and crystalised an ideal which dominated the position of working-class housing over the next century. The central-staircase access ensured maximum flexibility and enabled the block to be extended upwards as tenements, or laterally as terraces. The fireproof contruction and flat roofs of the Bloomsbury flats were repeated, but allied to a free Tudor exterior. The block was re-erected in Kennington Park. The hoped-for widespread use of the prototye failed to materialise - the Trusts were not geared up to repeating them extensively and local authorities had not entered the field of housing provision. Single works at Hertford and Abbots Langley, a terrace at Shadwell and Ramsgate, represented fairly solitary swallows of the anticipated summer.

Roberts was, however, a prolific writer and the model schemes were widely disseminated through his books as well as design sheets published by SICLC. At least one European scheme, the cite ouvriere at Mulhouse, appears to have been based on Robert's precedents. It is therefore regrettable that his career appears to have come to a premature end as a result of what Dr Curl primly refers to as 'an indiscreet liaison with a member of the lower orders'. The Evangelical conscience of Victorian England which had developed the benevolent paternalism that had fired the engines of reform was unable to countenance such a peccadillo by one of its proponents. Roberts retired to Florence for some years and comparative obscurity, although he continued to write and lecture on working-class housing. The SICLC became increasingly moribund in the face of more active new comers such as the Peabody Trust, founded in 1862, which profited from the pioneer work.

Dr Curl has evidently unearthed a wide array of prime sources from surviving members of the family, as well as international records. In his quest to bring his subject 'from the nineteenth century fog of obscurity', the welter of detail sometimes appears counter productive and biographical material jostles uncomfortably with discussion of Robert's substantive accomplishments, particularly in the first chapter. Does the awakening Evangelical conscience account for the change in direction of Robert's career following Fishmongers Hall? Or do we see a young architect, who reached his peak at design ability in an easthetic which was soon to become unfashionable, turning uneasily in other directions? Notwithstanding the detailed discussion of Evangelism, and the political attitude of **The Ecclesiologist** to Robert's rather gauche gothic churches, it is surprising that Pugin is not mentioned. His publication of **Contrasts** in 1836 drew a harsh parellel between architectural style, morality and environmental quality, and added Evangelical fervour to the Gothic

Revival and pointed it towards Christian Socialism. Nor is there reference to Ruskin who filled out the picture from the 1850s. As Dr Curl observes Roberts himself moved in the direction of Christian Socialism and, in discussion with Shaftesbury, a partnership that anticipated that of Unwin, Tudor Walters and Addison more than sixty years later. He urged the incorporation of sweeping housing powers in the Public Health legislation of the 1850s and 1860s. Roberts's successors included Octavia Hill and the Barnetts. One can see a direct lineage of reform broadening into the Garden City and Hampstead Garden Suburb, through the involvement of Raymond Unwin, whose outlook developed as a reaction against Christian Socialism and paternalism, but who waged the environmental campaign with equal fervour. Indeed comparison between Roberts's pioneering schemes and **Cottage Plans and Common Sense** would be instructive, as would the Model Cottages built for the Windsor Royal Society in 1852 set alongside any of the varied cottage groupings from New Earswick, Letchworth and Hampstead.

This would be to look beyond the scope of Dr Curl's study which, in its thorough and scholarly approach, exhibits the Victorian virtues of his subject. Even if Roberts does not quite emerge as the unique unsung hero of the sanitary reform and housing movement, his work has certainly been neglected and seriously undervalued. Dr Curl's book is an essential adjunct to our understanding of the dynamics of urban housing, not only for the middle decades of the nineteenth century, but as a contextual frame of reference for the varied contributions of Roberts's successors.

MERVYN MILLER
11 Silver Street, Ashwell,
Baldock, Herts.

S. Martin Gaskell (1982), **Building control: national legislation and the introduction of local bye-laws in Victorian England**, British Association for Local History, 64pp. £3.95 (£4.45 from the distributors MacDonald & Evans Distribution Services, Estover Road, Plymouth PL6 7PZ.), ISBN 0 7199 1100 1.

Houses are the products of many and varied influences – economic, social, cultural, historical, architectural and technical. Historians have recently been attempting to integrate these factors into a new interpretation of the built form which seeks to explain how and why houses came to be as they are. Yet, strangely absent from the recent discussion has been an adequate account of the development of building bye-laws in the Victoria period, and the effects which they had on house form. Few histories of housing go much beyond a brief reference to the Public Health Act of 1875 and the Model Bye-laws of 1877. It is acknowledged that they were largely instrumental in shaping the so-called 'bye-law' terrace of the late nineteenth century, which is still a marked characteristic of working-class districts in many northern and Midland industrial towns. As long ago as 1954 Profesor William Ashworth opined the judgement which subsequently became accepted as gospel. In his 'the genesis of modern British town planning', he wrote that nothing else made so much difference to the physical appearance and condition of British towns. Large parts of them were built under this regime and still survive. They seem a grim and depressing legacy, yet they represent a considerable advance on what came immediately before. The streets of this time were monotonous, but the monotony of order was an advance on the earlier monotony of chaos. They were devoid of all inspiration, but at least they were sanitary.

What Dr Gaskell has done in his short book is to trace in some detail the evolution of housing bye-laws between the 1840s and the 1880s, with particular reference to four towns, namely Leeds, Manchester, Sheffield and Newcastle-upon-Tyne. With its particular problems of urban expansion, Nottingham might have made an interesting comparison with these northern cities. He shows that even before the first general Public Health Act of 1848 there were already some 400 local Improvement Acts, obtained by individual towns by private Bill at costs as high as £12,000. They produced a patchwork of diverse and sometimes conflicting building regulations. Faced with the ineluctable facts of overcrowding, filth and disease, reformers were already pleading by the 1840s for national control in the form of a general Building Act. They were frustrated by a combination of laissez-faire ideology and the power of vested interests. The 1848 Act, on which Chadwick and others had pinned so much hope, proved ineffective in respect of building control, and died an early death.
But, Dr Gaskell argues, the Local Government Act which followed ten years later, in 1858, was a crucial if tentative step in the centralisation and professionalisation of the mechanism for the control of buildings. Under the accompanying Form of Bye-laws, regulations were drawn up respecting the width and construction of new streets, the structure of walls of new buildings, the adequacy of air space about buildings, and their drainage and sewerage: some specific clauses related to room sizes, the areas of windows and the construction of flues and hearths. Although only permissive, most provincial cities adopted new bye-laws in the 1860s based more or less closely on the 1858 Form, which became, in effect, the beginning of the concept of model bye-laws. In concentrating on the 1877 Bye-laws, historians have largely ignored this earlier precedent, which, twenty years later, was elaborated, clarified and refined.

This study performs a useful service to scholarship by recognising the importance of the 1858 Act which established the form which future building controls would take. It represented a workable compromise between the interests of local autonomy and the advocates of centralised control: bye-laws now had a national standard which towns could adopt if they wished but were equally free to vary in order to meet local traditions and practices. If they produced dreary monotony, this was not the fault of the bye-laws themselves so much as the lack of imagination of builders and the lack of resources of tenants to afford more individualised accommodation.

It seems ungenerous to ask for more in a 60-page account, but some deficiencies are worth noting. The booklet is sub-titled 'National legislation and the Introduction of Local Bye-laws in Victorian England'. It does not attempt to deal with the 28 Housing Acts passed during the period, and the interplay between these and the bye-laws. It does not adequately examine the processes of administration of bye-laws on the ground – the organisation, personnel and machinery of regulation, the inspectorial and legal mechanisms of enforcement, the evasions of and penalties for transgression. And it does not tell us of the interesting consequences of the bye-laws on housing form and town development. What was a 'bye-law' house like? What was it like to live in one? To be fair, that was not Dr Gaskell's aim, and by coincidence, these questions are in part answered by Martin Daunton's new book House and Home in the Victorian City (Edward Arnold, 1983) which focuses on 'the relatively short phase of "bye-law housing" in the forty or fifty years leading to the First World War'. The two may conveniently be read together.

John Burnett
Brunel Univesity

Michael J. Daunton (1983) **House and home in the Victorian city. Working class housing 1850-1914.** London, Edward Arnold (Studies in Urban History 7) £32.50 ISBN 0 7132 6384 4

'In some respects we are more familiar with the physical and social structure of Roman Britain than we are with the apparatus of suburban society in Victorian England.'

So wrote Professor Dyos in the preface of his study of Camberwell in 1961. Prior to his pioneering work on the suburb, researchers and authors had been generally content with the role of topographers or compilers of statistics, particularly in regard to public health, overcrowding or other demographic factors. Since then various aspects of the history of working-class housing have come under much closer scrutiny, following the example set by Dyos. Published works based on these studies range from the general to the particular. **Cruel Habitations: A History of Working-Class Housing, 1780-1918** by Enid Gauldie (1974) and **The English Terraced House** by Stefan Muthesius (1983) are typical examples. Now Martin Daunton has produced **House and Home in the Victorian City**, a study of working-class housing which concentrates on the private sector.

The Introduction to the book states that the bulk of existing literature has considered policy rather than actuality. It has paid more attention to the minority housing-types, such as those produced by philanthropic activity, rather than to the private housing-sector which accommodated the vast majority of the population. Daunton states that the by-law era has been described as the 'monotony of order'. The aim of the book is to answer certain questions by considering data from those provincial towns with a population of 50,000 or over in 1911. The questions posed include what were the social and economic relationships which arose from the ownership and management of these houses? What was it like to live in this 'monotony of order'?

In an attempt to appreciate what life was like in the streets built during this unique phase of urban development, the book is divided into three major sections, I The Development of Bye-Law Housing in Britain, II Rents and Rates, and III Residence. The book is wide ranging. Earlier chapters in section I examine the different types of private-sector housing that emerged. Section II covers the control and management of these houses, particularly landlord and tenant relationships. The final chapters in Section III deal with alternative forms of housing provision, such as workers' homes and local-authority dwellings, together with domestic technology, such as sanitary improvements.

It is this all-embracing approach which detracts most from the book as a whole. Indeed it reads as three separate books each of which could stand more or less on its own. The conclusion in Chapter 12 does not appear to relate to the wide variety of topics covered in the text, ranging from inward-looking courts to the installation of water-closets. It relates more to the 'housing crisis' of the early twentieth century, and the role of government and local authorities in the promotion of owner-occupation and council housing. This would appear to be a logical conclusion following the arguments laid down in Section II. The fascinating comparison of house and flat plans which emerges in various provincial towns, together with the interesting analysis which attempts to assess the reasons why they developed, was worthy of greater expansion, perhaps at the expense of other later chapters relating to the residence.

The major contribution of this book is the bringing together of so much

information concerning the landlord-tenant relationship, particularly in its comparison of experience of Scotland and England. It also describes how, and suggests the reasons why, landlord-tenant relationships were modified after 1914 to such an extent that this eventually led to the major decline of the private rented-sector of the housing market.

Daunton states in the preface that the book rests to a large extent upon the work of other scholars and this is reflected in the excellent compilation of references which provide a wealth of information for any reader wishing to either read around the subject or refer to specific sources. The same cannot be said, however, for the illustrations which have the appearance of being an afterthought in the way that they have been included and presented. Bunched together between pages 88 and 89, they are not referred to in the text. This may be a blessing in disguise because most of the photographs are of such poor quality that there was little point including them in the first place.

FRANK TROWELL
Leeds Polytechnic.

Harold Carter (1983) **An introduction to urban historical geography.** Edward Arnold, 222pp. Paperback £9.95, ISBN 0 7131 6386 0.

Until the 1960s, urban geography focussed on modern urban processes and urban historical geography, reconstructing historic cross-sections or explaining retrospectively the historical dimension of our recent urban environment. It represented a unified and complex field of geographical enquiry. There is no doubt that urban geography has now become more fragmented. Carter has demonstrated this trend by publishing in 1972 (3rd edition, 1981) one of the most modern handbooks of urban geography, **The study of urban geography**, in which an historic perspective is almost completely omitted. He has now published a volume devoted explicitly to the history of town and city. The recent phase in modern urban geography without any historical perspective is also illustrated in the handbooks of E. Lichtenberger (Stadtgeographie, 1979) and G. Braun (Stadtgeographie, 1982), and also in 'Progress in urban geography', edited by M. Pacione, 1983. The handbook by Scholler (Allgemeine Stadtgeographie, 1969) follows the traditional concept of an urban geography based on historic development.

Carter has established himself as one of the most progressive modern urban geographers. It is perhaps surprising that this first attempt at an introduction to urban historical geography should be written just by himself. His 'summary' shows that there is a rapidly developing urban historical geography, based on modern analytical settlement and social geography, helping to leave behind the traditional morphogenetic approach of a 'townscape geography'. The book looks at four main topics: 1) the origin and diffusion of urbanism; the evolution of the city system (urbanisation); the formation of the town plan (the image of urban design and the structure of urban extension); the internal structure of the city (central area, social areas). The author has room to pose only a small selection of the research questions that could be posed. Some important topics are left out. Carter nevertheless succeeds in drawing together a great deal of familiar and new data and ideas.

The literature from which the information is derived is almost entirely written in English. About 62 per cent of the 416 titles listed in the bibliography were

published in Britain, and most are concerned with British urban geography. About 26 per cent were published in the United States, and only 26 in foreign languages (French, Italian and German). Of these, 19 are English translations. The research and enormous number of publications from France, Germany and other European countries are almost completely ignored, despite their being in many respects basic in the field of urban history and urban historical geography. For a German reviewer who is deeply concerned with international cooperation in the field of urban historical geography, it is a matter of great regret that there are, for example, no references to the works of the most prominent German urban historical geographers (Dörries, Bobek, Schöller, Lichtenberger). The title and topic of the book promised more than this. Carter's **Study of urban geography** was translated into another European language (**Einfuhrung in die Stadtgeographie**, 1980, transl. by F. Vetter) with great success, and exerted an important influence. Because of its lack of concern for the European literature, there is a much weaker case for publishing a translation of this new book.

Carter has taken the word 'introduction' in the title very seriously. He leads the reader to selected, important publications. He summarises, or quotes, short passages from them. There are also annotated hints for further reading at the end of each chapter. Most of the 130 figures are reproduced from the literature cited. The points made in each work are discussed critically, and further questions posed. One might say that the 'Introduction' follows the style of a review article. It is a stimulating approach.

A chronological approach assumes only a secondary importance in the book. At times, it is hard to follow. Within the context of the origin and diffusion of urbanism, examples are drawn from different parts of the world and different periods. Most attention is focussed on the nineteenth century in the following three chapters. Such periods as the late medieval are more or less neglected. There is also little systematic treatment of the regional differences in urban development, function and design.

The back cover of the book claims that Carter has provided 'a historical introduction to the geography of towns... from the standpoint that any understanding of present towns must derive to a great extent from a consideration of the changing patterns... during past times'. From this, the reader would assume a retrospective approach. He will not find this. On the contrary, the book is much concerned with historic environments and processes of historic periods. There is no chapter devoted to the question of the retrospective approach, the historical analysis of old towns for conservation, or to the planning of the past. There is no hint of the numerous new historic towns atlases, all of them intended to analyse the historic dimension of today's urban environment.

Does Carter's book serve as an introduction to urban historical geography by drawing on the methods and findings of the last 70 years and more, or is it concerned only with the approaches and research of the most recent years? The findings of very recent research are given in chapters on social areas, the evolution of retailing, and system of tributary areas. Planning history is dealt with under the chapter 'the formation of the town plan', in response to the question 'In whose image is the city made'? The chapter traces the military, ornamental and social background to planning concepts through history

Carter has succeeded in meeting his main aim. Urban historical geography has acquired an introductory text, based on the concept of a modern analytic geographical approach. This was badly needed. The book will assuredly broaden and stimulate further research within the geographic discipline and, hopefully, interdisciplinary discussion.

DIETRICH DENECKE
Department of Geography,
University of Goettingen.

PUBLICATIONS

Dennis Hardy & Colin Ward (1983), **American dream, land, chicken ranches and the New Age**, Middlesex Polytechnic (Queensway, Enfield, Middlesex EN3 4SF), Geography and Planning Paper, 8, 18 pp ISBN 0 904 804 275.

In the absence of strong planning controls, American settlements do things which British observers sometimes find hard to comprehend. Sharp divisions between town and country are rarely to be seen. The structure of settlements is altogether looser in texture, with some parts densely-covered and others left empty. On the face of it, British settlements are generally more orderly. British observers have invariably returned with warning tales of what could happen when a society is unwilling to accommodate land-use and three-dimensional planning. It has been widely accepted that there is little that can be learnt from the American experience.

This paper questions that view. It attempts to demonstrate that disorder in the American landscape, far from being a result of carelessness and neglect, is the product of a deliberate philosophy. While there are undoubtedly physical costs to be counted, deliberate disorder may well be able to offer social gains. Far from dismissing American experience out-of-hand, there could well be lessons for British housing and planning. An unrelenting pursuit of order over the years may have been more costly than many would recognise.

Objections to disorder can no longer be simply a matter of aesthetics. Over the years, the single lot of land has permitted a wide variety of building and land use in the American landscape, ranging from personalised housing in high-income suburbs to low-income smallholdings further out. In the current context, a modicum of disorder in the British landscape – a product of people shaping their own living environment – might be a small price to pay for the social opportunities that can go with it.

Christopher Carter (1983), Innovations in planning thought and practice at Cumbernauld New Town, 1956-1962, The Open University (Faculty of Social Sciences, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes MK7 6AA), New Towns Study unit, 65pp.

The truly remarkable number of innovations embodied in the Scottish New Town of Cumbernauld can be related to the 'climate of the times', the attitude of the

Scottish Office, and, after designation, the changing attitude of Whitehall, the working practices of the Development Corporation, and the roles of a number of persons both as individuals and as a team. Cumbernauld influenced planning thought and practice In Britain during the 1960s, most notably in terms of approaches to housing design, traffic planning and vehicle/pedestrian segregation, landscape as an integral element in town design, town centre design, and the overall concept of trying to create a town as a meeting place and functioning unit.

The wider significance of Cumberland's innovations may arise, not so much from having been proved so successful or from having been overtaken by events, but rather from the way in which the methods adopted for identifying priorities and implementing objectives have enabled new town planning as a whole to advance.

U. A. Wannop (1982), **The future history of Glasgow**, University of Strathcylde, 24pp.

In his Inaugural Lecture as Professor of Urban and Regional Planning in the University, Professor Wannop addresses himself, as a working planner, to three questions, namely how great is the influence of the planner on history, how much evidence is there for the decline of the city of Glasgow, and thirdly how far is it time for a new step forward in the planning of the city? Sensitive and far-sighted planning is likely to prove as important in the future as it has in the past. The achievements in reshaping Clydeside during the last half decade have highlighted its potential as a 21st century city. A new view might now be taken of Glasgow, not as a failed city of the first industrial revolution, but as perhaps the earliest of British cities to emerge into the age of Western post-industrialisation.

Graeme A. S. Purves (1983), **An introduction to the work of Sir Frank Mears**, Edinburgh College of Art/Heriot-Watt University, Department of Town and Country Planning, Research Paper, 4, 13pp.

This short account of the life of Sir Frank Mears considers some of the major influences on his career and town and country planning. It describes how, in addressing himself to a wide variety of planning problems throughout Scotland, he interpreted and gave expression to the ideas of Sir Patrick Geddes and concludes that, in so doing, he made an important contribution to the development of a distinctively Scottish planning tradition.

Michael Bannon, The changing context of development planning, **Administration**, (1983), 31 (2), 112-146.

Provides a detailed examination of the background to the introduction of the Republic of Ireland's first mandatory planning legislation – the Local Government (Planning and Development) Act, 1963. The paper describes the close links which existed between capital investment programming, national economic planning and the perceived role of physical planning in Ireland in the 1960s. Physical planning was viewed as a catalytic agent of development. Although much of the inspiration for this belief in the positive role of planning came from

North America, the legislation itself was modelled closely on the Town and Country Planning Acts of England and Wales. While the 1963 Act was capable of considerable flexibility in interpretation, any positive role for planning was ultimately dependent upon adequate staffing for development plan preparation, a greater emphasis upon regional planning and the reform of local government to enable local authorities to operate as Development Corporations. In the absence of such reforms the positive vision of Development planning gave way to regulatory Development Control, with a corresponding loss of public support for planning.

Marjatta Hietala (1983), Urbanization : contradictory views. Finnish reactions to the continental discussion at the beginning of the 20th century, Studia Historica (published by the Finnish Historical Society), 12 Miscellanea, pp. 7-20 ISSN 0081-6493 ISBN 951-9254-41-2.

In an appraisal of the urbanisation process in Finland, and the role of the Agrarian Union, the author illustrates how city advocates identified themselves closely with the European metropolitan spirit and came into sharp conflict with those who feared urban development would weaken rural culture and lead to emigration from the countryside.

MONUMENTEN & LANDSCHAPPEN (Brussels), 2de jaargang, 5 September/October 1983, ISSN 0770 4948.

This issue of the Belgian magazine M & L is devoted to 'the reconstruction of Belgian towns after the First World War'. Published in Dutch, each of the papers has an English abstract. The articles are: The reconstruction of Denermonde as the construction of an artificial decor, by M. Smets & K. Verbruggen; The continuity of an embellishment idea during the Reconstruction. The Plan Vierin for Nieuwpoort (1906-1920), by H. de Laet; Antwerp, Lier and Mechlin. A debate concerning town planning and architecture on the occasion of three reconstruction contests, by R. de Meyer; Architect Richard Acke and house-building in the frontal area, by H. Stynen; From town architecture to town planning. A modernistic exercise by Raphael Verwilghen, by P. Uyttenhove.

NOTES AND NEWS

EMERGENCE OF IRISH PLANNING

Publication of the Dublin P.H.G. Conference papers is going ahead. Papers for the first volume – **The Emergence of Irish Planning** are now in the process of being set. This volume includes:

> Arnold Horner : Growth and expansion of Dublin 1880–1980; Mary Daly : Housing conditions and the genesis of reform 1880–1920; Fred Aalen : The working class housing movement and the origins of planning; Michael Bannon : The emergence of town planning movement; Mervyn Miller : Raymond Unwin and the Planning of Dublin; Michael Gough : Socio-economic conditions and the genesis of planning in Cork.

It is hoped that this volume will be available in late Spring or early Summer. The second volume with papers by Bannon, Nowlan, Mawhinney and Hendry will follow Volume I by some three months.

CITIES

With the sub-title 'The international quarterly on urban policy, the first number of this journal appeared in August 1983, published by Butterworth Scientific and with John Edmondson as managing editor. Focussed on the practical aspects of policy making and implementation, the multidisciplinary journal will cover all issues relevant to the design and evaluation of policies for urban areas. Articles for submission should be sent to Journals Division, P.O. Box 63, Westbury House, Bury Street, Guildford, GU2 5BH, UK.

THE REVIEW

The Institute of Transportation Studies of the University of California, Berkeley, 94720, publishes a free newsletter. Entitled the **Review**, it covers current transportation research, and offers an opportunity to keep up with the latest in urban transportation developments.

IAN NAIRN

The Times of 18 August 1983 published an obituary to Ian Nairn, who died at the age of 52. It described how his main role had been as an architectural and planning missionary with a rare talent for writing about these subjects in language that the uninformed could understand, and that could arouse in them a sense of personal involvement. As a consequence, he exerted a pervasive influence on public as well as professional opinion, and on official policies.

His main contribution to **The Architectural Review** was to edit and write a special number and then a monthly feature entitled 'Outrage' in which malpractices of all kinds particulary rife in the 1950s, but continuing to some extent to this day, were pilloried: the proliferation of overhead wires, the horrible design of concrete lamposts, the wasteful lay-out of suburban roads, the absence of control on the growing fringes of towns that produced the chaotic scenery for which Nairn coined the designation Subtopia. His campaigns, however, were far from negative; he was always prepared to put forward the proper answer at the same time as he denounced what was wrong. The Times obituary cited Nairn's

further publications, including those written in collaboration with Sir Nikolaus Pevsner.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

At Harvard, the Department of Visual and Environmental Studies, in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and the Landscape Architectural Department in the Faculty of Design have created a senior professional position to support teaching and research in two fields, namely the environmental development that has evolved from planning, and the broad range of social and cultural factors that has affected evolution and change in the environment. The courses offered by this new chair are intended to prepare students in looking at their environment with greater awareness and understanding. Applications for appointment to the chair were invited by early February.

HERIOT-WATT UNIVERSITY

At a ceremony in July 1984, the degree of Doctor of Science in the Faculty of Environmental Studies will be conferred on Gordon Cherry, Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at Birmingham University. The degree is 'in recognition of his contribution to the history of planning and practice in the 20th century'. Gordon Cherry is, of course, Chairman of the Planning History Group.

ANGLO-FRENCH PERSPECTIVES ON THE CREATION AND EXPERIENCE OF THE DOMESTIC ENVIRONMENT

One of the dangers of the Planning History Group is that we may become set in our ways. We have been told for some time, notably by A.D. King, that 'planning' is best seen as a universal process of environmental creation, stretching across the centuries and the continents, rather than the bureaucratic intervention in free-market processes during late industrialisation epitomised by the 1947 Act. The opportunity of not only attending, but also contributing to, an Anglo-French symposium on the ways in which people <u>live</u> in their housing environment was therefore too good to miss. So, with eighteen other participants drawn from France, Switzerland, the U.S.A. and Britain, I found myself drawn into a fascinating debate on 'L'habitation: production sociale des modes d'habiter' at Ifor Evans Hall, University of London, on 9-11th September 1983.

The conference convener was Ian Robinson (Bruenel University). Like a number of contributors he was a sociologist, but there were equally strong groups of architects and historians. The tripartite division is an over-simplification, however. There was a strong emphasis on anthropology within the sociological group, while the architects leaned heavily in their activities towards sociology. A number of participants had equally strong interests in two or more of the three groups. Moreover, the most brilliant star in the methodological and epistemological firmament to shine at the symposium, phenomenology, was reflected to varying degrees in each of the groups, though principally among their French and Swiss elements. It will already be obvious that the pure unalloyed historians were in a tiny minority, so they were in no position to dictate the terms of the debate. Planning history had either to make a significant contribution to environmental issues of apparently almost cosmic significance, or retire gracefully to the sidelines. I am not a dispassionate judge of how it responded to the challenge, but I doubt if mine will be the last word on the matter.

The early stages of the symposium were reminiscent of the Battle of Marignan in which the English were invited to fire first in order to enhance the quality of the ultimate French triumph. The author of this report was invited to start the proceedings with 'The historian's approach to the production and use of housing' under the chairmanship of Tony King. The paper blithely hailed the current 'historicisation' of the social sciences and set out an economic historian's view of housing within what was claimed to be a 'world-economy' perspective. Leaning heavily on Lefebvre, Castells and Harvey it was suggested that the Industrial Revolution is the key discontinuity in the history of the urban environment and that as industrialism runs its course the main issues of social conflict shift from the sphere of manufacturing production and investment to that of the creation and consumption of the urban environment. The implications that the quality, quantity and type of housing respond to macro-economic forces, and that the individual is the helpless prisoner of his environment, even when he feels fully in control of it as a member of an 'affluent society', were firmly challenged by Henri Raymond (Institut de Sociologie Urbaine, Paris) in the first of a series of interventions which, culminating in his own concluding paper, set an indelible mark on the whole of the symposium. Raymond was unhappy about the world-economy approach, with its implication that housing is produced by an all-powerful market, on a world-wide scale. He was joined by Louis Sauer (Carnegie-Mellon University) in his doubts about whether the Industrial Revolution was a discontinuity in housing history, and reservations about the whole tenor of the paper were also expressed by Peter Willmott (Policy Studies Institute). Alan Lipman (Welsh National School of Architecture) questioned the idea of long swings in architectural involvement in housing, with architects no longer interested in social engineering; he thought that social engineering was as important in architecture now as it had been in the 1930s, '40s and '50s – only the forms were different. Gilles Barbey (Swiss National Research Council) was unhappy about the assertion that architects had jumped from designing for the rich and powerful to designing for the masses; on the Continent, their nineteenth-century involvement in designing middle-class apartment blocks had produced a much smoother transition.

Overall, the group clearly wanted to see a more anthropological approach to housing which would centre on the experience of the individual <u>within</u> the environment and his influence <u>upon</u> it. Later in the conference, A.D. King's paper, 'The social production of dwelling form: propositions for detate', was to generate a similar reaction to what a standard Planning History Group audience would have no doubt regarded as a daringly avant-garde piece of revisionism. Summarising his forthcoming book, King put the emergence and proliferation of dwelling forms in a 'world system framework', arguing that the forces of society, economy and culture sustain a quite small number of dwelling types which in the modern economy are increasingly the product of the resolution of issues of consumption and the circulation of capital. He lamented the lack of data on, and interest in, housing form. Henri Raymond, however, was less concerned with data deficiencies than with King's mechanistic approach. Accusing King of using the market as a <u>deus ex machina</u>,

he maintained that market forces, especially when articulated on a world scale, could not provide a comprehensive explanation of the housing phenomenon. Not for the last time, he implied that the British were way behind the times theoretically; King's argument was reminiscent of 1970s Althusser but what, he asked, had Althusser explained? Raymond thought that the influence on the market of cultural factors - the 'mode of living' - ought to be considered. France and Britain were both advanced industrial societies but their very different habitats were clearly the product of more than just market forces. He made a distinction between 'building', which might well be the product of the market as perceived by King, and 'housing', which was a much more complex and interesting phenomenon.

An early taste of French alternative approaches to the study of housing had meanwhile been provided by Dominique Druenne, an architect associated with the Institut de l'Habitat, Paris. In 'Les origines de l'habitat urbain français', he put forward some results of a research methodology based on the formulation of a typology of domestic spaces. Using plans of dwellings taken from architectural treatises, competitions and projects from the seventeenth century onwards, he described the evolution of the arrangements of rooms most commonly provided for the various social classes, principally in Paris but also in various provincial towns. The typicality of these plans had been confirmed by field work, using teams of researchers. Curiously, Druenne provided little explanation of the evolution he portrayed, but he pointed out that the number of rooms and functional differentiation between them tended to increase over time, presumably in step with improved living standards and changes in the family, particularly in the area of attitudes to personal privacy. Barbey suggested that these published plans might be superior to what was built for most people, but Druenne maintained that the field work results were conclusive. He also partially dismissed Barbey's suggestion that a number of new housing types were imported into France from around 1860, claiming that their adaption to French usage was more significant than their novelty. Moreover, foreign influences was almost entirely limited to Paris and in the provinces a direct line of evolution from traditional plans and arrangements could be seen. Alison Ravetz (Leeds Polytechnic) asked about the influences of servants on the design of houses and apartment blocks, suggesting a contrast between France, where servants ostensibly slept in the attics, and England where a variety of arrangements was adopted. Druenne, however, suggested that there were rather less differences between England and France than the traditional stereo-types might suggest, the number of servants being the main influence on their accommodation. In some cases, French servants were housed in separate buildings, or in wings. Above all,

Druenne emphasised the continuity of the main housing type, the two-roomed dwelling.

Mark Swenarton (Bartlett School of Architecture) made an interesting attempt to pull a number of strands in 'Social housing in Europe from the First World War to the Slump, c. 1918-1933'. He identified a distinct wave of social housing in his period, perhaps underestimating continuities from before 1914 and into the later 1930s, but emphasising the special characteristics of a period in which the 'Social Democratic' parties brought to power by the war were principally judged by their performance in tackling the housing problem, given their unwillingness to undertake more fundamental reforms. The result was a major change in the financing and organising of housing construction, and in the role of self-awareness of architects. Behind the political facade, he argued, lay industrial capital, which could persuade even 'bourgeois' parties like the British Conservative Party to introduce social housing, if possible at the expense of the landowning fraction of capital, so that it could reduce wages without threatening social peace. Swenarton's Europe-wide perspective was ambitious but his argument worked well and reinforced the British 'political economy' approach. However, discussion of the paper centred on a Continental concern, the extent to which social housing design incorporated 'bourgeois' models and so either promoted a middle-class way of life among the working class, or set up conflicts between the occupant and his habitat.

This preoccupation foreshadowed the next paper, 'La maison bourgeoise en France au XIe siècle', by Claude Bauhain (U.P. VIII, Paris). Amplifying the themes already defined by Druenne, she linked architects' conceptions of the home with the changing view of the individual in the nineteenth century. This view derived from the new bourgeois model of the family which had been emerging since the seventeenth century. Bauhain saw the house as synthesising two important components of this model, the enhancement of the status and life of the individual (individualisation), and the need to create external expressions of class characteristics (représentation). Her paper delved as deeply into the history of the family as it did into that of housing, and made much use of source material derived from contemporary novels. She was especially interested in the creation and use within the house of spaces for intimate functions involving the married couple, or the mother and child. Architects' treatises and pattern books increasingly rationalised and reduced these new dwelling forms to make them accessible to middle-income groups during the nineteenth century. Perla Korosec-Serfaty (Université Lois Pasteur, Strasbourg) asked about the role of servants in making domestic systems

work, and the position of children in these homes. Bauhain's reply suggested, not for the last time in the symposium, that children were still a blind spot in the phenomenological approach, but the point about servants was well taken and was reinforced by Ravetz, who outlined the existence of two spatial systems in the bourgeois home, the one occupied by the servants and the other by the masters. The bigger the house, the more readily the servants' working and circulation space could be completely segregated, but there were nevertheless times when servants had to penetrate into the most intimate personal space of the masters, for instance in their bedroom work. This necessity, Ravetz pointed out, generated a duel temporal system which overlay the spatial one, with servants moving into spaces vacated by the masters at regular times of day in order to carry out their duties with the minimum of disturbance. Less affluent households used reduced versions of these arrangements, which had their impact on house design and use, and on master-servant relationships. The issue then arose of whether housing reformers had foisted a petty-bourgeois – and therefore servant-related – house-form onto the working classes in the later nineteenth century. Most of the discussants, following the logic of the debate so far, were prepared to agree that they had indeed done so, with Swenarton, for instance, seeing the Tudor Walters recommendations as an expression of this transfer. The author of this report, fearing that social-control reductionism was getting out of hand at this point, wanted to know how Raymond Unwin's advocacy of the non-parlour house fitted in with this interpretation. Swenarton explained it in terms of a bohemian or Ruskinian strand within nineteenth-century bourgeois cultural modes – a not unconvincing response within this perspective.

Some of these issues were taken up on the following morning by Rosemary Mellor (University of Manchester), in 'Mass production and private lives'. Her central concern, from her perspective as a sociologist, was the growth of the cult of privacy since the nineteenth century and its reflection in recent housing design policy. Privacy, in Mellor's view, had become 'an obsession'. People moving upward in the housing market sought total seclusion, so houses tended to move back from the street into the middle of the sites, the perimeters of which were marked by physical barriers. Women played out their roles within this spatial framework; while ostensibly functioning as influential members of family units, they were actually subject to 'the hegemony of the market'. Mellor then moved on to the role of the State in promoting 'regularisation' – the State had a 'civilising mission' in pursuit of which it imposed order on people's lives and their environment. This led on to the theme of 'convention' which, she argued, had not been fully incorporated into

discussions of hegemony. Finally, she discussed the system of housing standards, which were progressively established by professionals working in the service of the State. These standards tended increasingly to incorporate and reflect the processes which she had isolated earlier. Finally, she provided a case study in the shape of the British high-rise housing episode within the public sector.

Ian Robinson's paper, 'Producing the consumer: housing evaluation in perspective', explored an important aspect of the regularisation process, the user surveys and evaluation studies which had multiplied in recent years. Contrary to initial expectations, they had revealed strikingly uniform levels of user satisfaction. However, suggested Robinson, to measure, 'satisfaction' might not mean a great deal. We need to have a fuller understanding of the conceptual implications of 'satisfaction'. Moreover, we needed to note that most surveys had been conducted by the suppliers of housing, whether private developers or the State, and to consider the possibility that evaluation did not work in the interests of the consumers. Finally, in recent years, considerations of public order had been very important in both housing evaluation and related policy decisions, reflecting the reduction in resources devoted to public housing. This feature had been particularly prominent in the U.S.A. but was not visible in Britain.

Robinson's paper was fully representative of the (by now) clear 'British' approach to housing in which the consumers were seen as victims of the market, the State, or hegemonic forces. Fortunately, Alison Ravetz was present to head off the predictable 'French' reaction with her 'The home of women: the relationship of women to English house design – an historical problem outlined'. She began from the premiss that social organisation is governed by three considerations – social class, gender and generation. Paradoxically, however, women had had little or nothing to do with the design of houses, even though the house was the main location of their activity. On the contrary, house design in Britain had proceeded historically according to class criteria, not gender criteria. Since the middle of the nineteenth century the idea of the working housewife had grown up in step with increasing difficulties in obtaining servants.

Where women had made a contribution to the creation of housing, it was primarily in management rather than design or construction. This was not to dismiss them out of hand – Octavia Hill, whatever her limitations, had been far-sighted and influential, above all in the stress she laid on the interaction between people and their environment. In this, Ravetz argued, Octavia Hill had expressed a specifically

feminine point of view. Meanwhile, the living patterns of the middle and working classes had converged in the later nineteenth century. This process was not completed, however, until the 1940s, so that perceptions of the women's domestic role had retained a class dimension until after the Second World War. Only since that time had the modern housewife emerged fully in gender terms. As Swenarton pointed out in the discussion, there was now emerging a general picture of the bourgeois housing model in which the men provided the house while the women arranged and managed it. However, he drew attention to the involvement of women in some aspects of design, beginning with Christine Frederick's contribution to kitchen planning in the early twentieth century. Ravetz thought that Catherine Beecher's house plans in the 1840s provided a better, and earlier, example of what women could do. These labour-saving designs, arranged around a central kitchen, reflected the scarcity of servants in North America. In an interesting intervention, Nicole Haumont (Institut de Sociologie Urbaine, Paris) agreed (on the basis of contemporary surveys carried out by her teams) that the women's right to run the house was clearly recognised within the household.

The woman's main priority was therefore to establish a clear physical division between the reception areas, which could be kept clean and tidy, and work areas where a degree of dirt and disorder could be tolerated. If the physical design of the home did not permit a ready separation of these public and private spaces, the woman was frustrated and other household members suffered in consequence. Women who were critical of the design of their homes often remarked that a woman architect would have done it differently, but Haumont felt they were deluding themselves. In common with several other discussants of the potential of the woman architect, she believed that women practitioners were too fully incorporated into the architectural profession to develop a gender-related approach to domestic design. Indeed, Clare Cooper (University of California, Berkeley) suggested that architects were so dominated by the heroic conception of their role that they regarded the use

of user-survey data as 'effeminate'. These echoes of Ayn Rand's The Fountainhead permeated a very lengthy discussion of women's influence on housing design which, for the first time in the symposium, produced a partial synthesis of the 'British' and 'French' approaches.

In 'Domestic' space and the regulation of daily life', Roderick J. Lawrence (Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne) returned to the historical genesis of dwelling form. He was interested in the articulation of spaces, and therefore in the location and nature of the barriers between them. In relation to the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland between 1860 and 1960, he set out to establish how, and by whom, space was being created. His use of plans for this morphogenetic study recalled Druenne's, but for the use of domestic spaces he relied heavily on the tenancy agreements and sets of rules for collective dwellings which had been introduced from the 1890s, beginning in Geneva, as foreign capital began to move into Swiss housing. The new stipulations were designed to counter established usages now considered inimical to the proper running of the building, and thus provided a unique perspective on the traditional usage of Swiss housing, at any rate in multi-family blocks. There was therefore, Lawrence argued, no direct relationship between the individual and the environment; what counted was the individual's usage practices, which could change, or could be changed by authority. This point was, of course, equally relevant to the use of older housing by social groups of declining affluence, a point which Druenne had ignored in his efforts to establish a clear social typology of newly-built housing. There was some discussion of the applicability of Lawrence's perspective to design, but no clear conclusions emerged.

Marion Segaud (Université de Paris X) summarised a forthcoming book by François Lévy and herself on the anthropology of space. Looking well beyond a purely housing perspective, she pointed out that pace had only recently become a subject of

research. She also had a stong interest in boundaries. but she was modest about her book. claiming that it merely set some elements of this new anthropology of space within a general cultural context. and suggested a method – the study of space as a social product.

More directly related to the theme of the symposium was Perla Korosec-Serfaty's. 'Uses and experience of the home'. Hers was primarily a psychological approach. inspired by the Freudian school and drawing on her interviews of a sample of Strasbourg residents whose homes had been broken into by thieves. Analysis of this experience of intrusion. she argued. permitted a perception of the relationship between an individual and the home. It revealed. above all. that the home was par excellence a private or even secret space the granting of access to which was the occupier's most cherished right. Burglary was therefore regarded as a defilement – a 'brutal appropriation of secrets'. Linguistic analysis of the interviews showed that the subjects constantly inter-related the concepts of 'body' and 'house'. and the term 'rape' was often used to describe the intrusion. There was also much reference to the intrusive impact of the 'gaze' of the outsider on intimate objects and spaces. echoing Sartre's remark that the individual is immobilised or objectified by those who look at him. From all this. Korosec-Serfaty concluded that the house and the individual identity were closely intertwined. and that the hidden was central to the experience of the home.

This stimulating but highly controversial interpretation was balance by Nicole Haumont's behavioural contribution. 'Housing: the relationship between interior and exterior space'. Developing a point outlined in more general terms by Segaud. she stressed the essential inter-relationship of the space within the home and that outside it. and emphasised the importance of the transitional space which linked the two. She used survey data to investigate these relationships in the single-family house. where the transitional spaces could be perceived most clearly. Especially interested

in the front garden. she distinguished between its functional role as a means of keeping children and pets away from the dangers of the streets. and its 'representational' character as a reflection of the status and norms of the household. Normally. the front garden was used to demonstrate incorporation into the neighbourhood; unkempt front gardens were often cited by critical neighbours as symptoms of more obnoxious characteristics inimical to the conduct of acceptable family life. A much greater degree of disorder was tolerated in the back gardens even though much more family activity was carried on in this (non-transitional) space. In the last ten years or so. French developers had built so-called 'nouveaux villages' composed of identical. owner-occupied houses within a condominium. These developments were cheap enough to attract two very different groups – people beginning their housing careers and aspiring to better housing. and those ending their housing careers by at last climbing out of the rental sector into a home considered capable of enhancing their security during retirement. The developer provided open front gardens as a symbol of the new. 'American' way of life which he used as an advertising feature. As time passed. the owners tended to enclose such private space outside the home as was legally theirs. and to appropriate areas of public space contiguous to the home even though these legally belonged to the condominium. Fences. hedges. parking bays. gnomes and miniature windmills all had their part to play in this creeping privatisation campaign.

There was discussion on whether these practices were culturally determined – Haumont thought they were but the 'British' view was that they were class-specific; upper-class house-owners in both Britain and the U.S. were prepared to keep their front gardens open on estates where this practice was the norm. All agreed. however. that conformism was the dominating force. Perhaps the answer lay in the more pronounced single-class composition of English. and especially American. suburban neightbourhoods. which reduced the need for barriers around individual properties.

In 'Phenomenological research into a person's relationship to his room', Giles Barbey returned, from his own perspective as an architect, to some of the social-sciences concerns raised by Korosec-Serfaty. He was interested in the affective, rather than the functional, relationship between the individual and space. As a practising architect, he wanted to make space more meaningful, but to do so he had to understand nature of space. He had begun with the room, as the smallest individual space unit, yet one which had been ignored in housing studies. Within his phenomenological approach, volume, dimensions, degree of enclosure, lighting, colours, texture and even smell were all important. He stressed, moreover, that the user turns the room from a physical space into a mental space. Following Walter Benjamin, he distinguished between the room as a case or sleeve, enclosing the individual, and as a mental universe. He had constructed a typology of rooms and believed that they could be reduced to three types – the narrow, constricted cell, the open, square salon, and the rectangular, laterally lit gallery or studio. Korosex-Serfaty was enthusiastic about Barbey's approach to 'the culture of space' but questioned his search for the permanent feature of a room and his consequent emphasis on dimensions and form. Barbey replied that the shape of a room was an almost automatic stimulus of timeless reactions; the cell, for instance, was always associated with institutions and users of such space, even in modern hotels, responded accordingly.

All this was interesting enough, but the contribution of the distinct group of psychological investigators which had by now identified itself within the symposium was crowned by Clare Cooper's extraordinary presentation, 'The house as mirror of the self'. Having long had an interest in Jungian psychology, she had at first approached the environment through novels, dreams and autobiographies. However, dissatisfied with the degree of understanding she had achieved by these means, she had mastered Gestalt therapy and had develped an interview technique based on role-playing. Volunteer subjects who had indicated a positive or a negative relationship with their houses were invited to represent their houses in drawings and then persuaded to 'talk to the house'. At a later stage subjects were persuaded to impersonate the house itself, as it might talk to its owner. As houses and life-histories became increasingly intertwined, other individuals and objects, such as parents, friends or trees in the garden could be brought into the game, with subjects playing up to five roles in the later stages. Close analysis of these results confirmed Korosec-Serfaty's conclusions about the identification of home and individual, but Cooper's methodology, while having important ethical implications as the social scientist approached the domain of the psycho-analyst, opened up completely novel perspectives for the investigation of experience. It was quickly pointed out, and readily admitted by Cooper, that her problematic, her methodology and her subject had a distinctly Californian flavour (thus, incidentially, strenthening the 'French' case for the primacy of the cultural approach), but this recognition reinforced rather than undermined Clare Cooper's status as a prophet within a discussion the dominant focus of which had switched in just a few minutes from Paris to Los Angeles.

Appropriately enough, the other American contribution, by the Easterner Louis Sauer, was more conventional. In 'Social meaning and the development process for the production of housing architecture', Sauer regretted the lack of debate about the design of housing among American architects. He had listened with interest, he said, to what he described as 'a European debate' on housing but it was important to recognise what had been omitted. As a practitioner and teacher of architecture, he was concerned with the production of houses in terms of both its programme and its cost components. Cost was best calculated over the long term. Over the forty years which followed the completion of a new house, construction accounted for only 5 per cent of the total cost over that period, and the proportion was falling. To make housing cheaper, therefore, there was little point in paring construction costs:

instead, attention should turn to costs that were still rising – land, development, and especially finance, the latter accounting for 45 per cent of the total forty-year cost at current interest rates. To understand housing, we had to understand not just the occupant, but all the actors in the production process, and especially the financial actors. Moreover, we had to make our conclusions simple, for architects had a high resistance to the written word at the best of times, making jargon-laden prescriptions completely unproductive.

Alan Lipman (Welsh National School of Architecture) provided an interesting digression into the contradictions raised by the grouping of in-care adolescents into 'family' units, but he shed little light on the spatial issues raised by other contributors. Consequently, it was left to an Anglo-French duo, about to embark on the only internationally collaborative research project to be represented in the proceedings, to wind up the symposium. In 'Inner city housing in Britain after 1945', Peter Willmott returned to one of the aspects of State housing policy discussed by Rosemary Mellor. In the long term, he wanted to relate it to work on informal social groups. Meanwhile he limited himself to a review of the high-rise episode in the light of Patrick Dunleavy's new interpretation in The Politics of Mass Housing. He identified three sets of actors: the professional interest of planners and architects, the local councillors, and the construction firms. As early as 1957, he and Michael Young had denounced high-rise as a mistaken policy. France too had gone through a high-rise phase, but its products had mainly been concentrated in suburban grands ensembles, creating a very different problem from the British one, which had simply exacerabated the multiple tribulations of the inner city. Although Willmott was clearly well aware of French preoccupations, his picture of an alien housing form imposed on the powerless masses conformed to the standard 'British' approach.

Henri Raymond's 'Architecture and technostructure: a sociological approach to spatial organisation' gave a foretaste of the French side of the project. Dealing with residential planning policies in France over a similar period, 1945-80, Raymond identified an important 'technostructure' composed of a complex of important professional organisations heavily influenced by engineers. This 'technostructure' was firmly in place before the Modern Movement produced its ideas for new cities, and architects tended to blame it for their failure to impose coherent new forms on France's rapidly expanding urban areas. He illustrated the point by referring to the diversity of urban forms in the Paris suburb of Choisy-le-Roi, and went on to support his conclusions by case studies of Le Corbusier's frustrating experiences at La Rochelle and Saint-Dié between 1945 and 1948. In these cases, Le Corbusier had assumed that a single word of command from the 'technostructure' would lead to the implementation of his plans, but the command was never given. Instead, the 'technostructure' responded to the local opposition to Le Corbusier's sweeping changes, producing a more diversified and less radical reconstruction.

Raymond's interpretation secured general approval, and Korosec-Serfaty rightly remarked that it bridged the gap between the British and French approaches. The author of this report wondered whether Le Corbusier was typical, and asked how and why Auguste Perret had been able to get his own way in a major reconstruction at Le Havre, but Raymond rightly pointed out that Perret's ideas were not as iconoclastic as his one-time pupil's, and that in the absence of a Perret archive as rich as Le Corbusier's, the question was probably impossible to answer. The symposium thus ended on a harmonious note, but it was symptomatic of the whole occasion that, in the eyes of the Continental participants, it was a French contribution which had done most to bring the two sides together.

What conclusions should be drawn from this stimulating and even exciting confrontation? First, there is a distinct danger that as Britain assumes a peripheral economic status within both Europe and the North Atlantic system, its intellectual

preoccupations with monolithic class. State and hegemonic structures no longer seem capable of securing a sympathetic hearing from an international audience. However, this may be a unduly pessimistic view which should certainly not discourage British social scientists from making a contribution to some of the methodological issues raised by the symposium.

Three inter-related problems in particular stood out. First, there was clearly a need to relate space to groups, and not just to individuals. Secondly, children were almost completely ignored, even though they are arguably the main users of domestic space. Thirdly, now that interior space was being understood, at any rate from the point of view of the adult individual, exterior space had to be reincorporated - not only in the form of contiguous space such as front gardens, but in that of the natural environment as a whole. That these further issues were raised so clearly was to the credit of the high quality of the contributions to this symposium. Ian Robinson and his international steering committee deserve our warmest congratulations and thanks.

ANTHONY SUTCLIFFE
University of Sheffield.

NORRIS, TENNESSEE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

On October 14, 1983, Norris, Tennessee, began a three-day celebration of it Golden Anniversary - exactly 50 years to the day after the first spade of earth was turned to begin construction on one of America's most unique planning experiments. Norris' significance lies in two interrelated historical developments. As the chronological link between Radburn, New Jersey (1928), and the Roosevelt Administration's Greenbelt Towns (1935), Norris is very much a part of the garden city movement in America; and as a product of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Norris enjoys a direct association with the Nation's boldest, systematic program in regional development. This community and region - the twin concerns of planning in the first half of the 20th century - are embodied in the history of the town. And since these concerns have recently reemerged after a post-War War II preoccupation among planners for abstract regional models, Norris has once again gained relevance - not only as a unique historical artifact, but also as a vibrant case study of alternative planning principles and design.

In the opening session of the 'Norris, Tennessee " A celebration and community development conference', Donald Krueckeberg' of Rutgers University, ably traced the historical threads which led to the creation of Norris. The intellectual lineage, Krueckeberg pointed out, began with early 19th century utopian socialistic experiments in communal living. It continued with the environmental designs of Frederick Law Olmstead, found expression in a vision of dramatic, but peaceful, change articulated by Edward Bellamy in his classic work, Looking Backward, and was graphically described at the turn of the century by the English court stenographer turned reformer, Ebenezer Howard, in Garden Cities of Tomorrow. It was translated into concrete forms at Letchworth (1904) and Welwyn Garden City (1920) in England, and Sunnyside (1924) and Radburn in the United States, was forcefully advocated by members of the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA) in the 1920s, and gained political support in the 1930s from Rexford Tugwell, one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's 'braintrusters'.

In this broad chronological sweep of the garden city movement, Krueckeberg described 100 years of intellectual ferment leading to the construction of Norris. Intellectual travelers on the 'peaceful path to real reform' by no means marched in lockstep. Howard, for example, disassociated himself from Bellamy's centralized,

nationalistic reform impulses and opted instead for a system of regionalized social cities. Tugwell, despite his suport for garden city-inspired greenbelt towns, ridiculed members of the RPAA as hopelessly romantic and naive. But beyond these differences, garden city travelers shared a rich, common heritage: an Anglo-American belief that decentralized patterns of growth promoted a healthy environment for personal and community development; a conviction that deep-seated social change could be attained without cataclysmic political change; an unfaltering emphasis upon the value and power of educating; and an assumption that a balanced physical environment was inherently related to a balanced economic and social environment. Thus the quest for a harmonious urban, rural, and primeval landscape was matched by a quest for equality, neighborliness, and family interaction. Each would find a prominent place not as by-products of economic growth but rather as the foremost concerns for planned development.

Norris, therefore, drew upon a wealth of intellectual capital that had been invested in town planning monographs and experiments for over 100 years. The debt the community owed to his diverse investment could be seen not only in the greenbelt design, but also among the experience of those responsible for its plan. Arthur E. Morgan, TVA Board Chairman, was a self-taught engineer who also served as President of Antioch College where he developed an innovative work-study program and became a leading spokesperson for progressive education. Obstinate and often zealous in his beliefs (an attitude shared by the utopian socialists), Morgan possessed that rare quality of bifocal vision which enabled him to see technology not as an end in itself, but rather in complex interrelationship to social change. As a biographer of Edward Bellamy, he drew a direct link to the reformist ideals expressed by the author of Looking Backward; as a teacher (it was Morgan who created a 33-hour workweek and established an off-hours training program for TVA workers to improve their skills) he, too, shared the belief in the value of education; as an administrator and engineer, he ardently believed that social change should be

(indeed must be) insulated from politics, not only in the parochial sense of patrongage but also in the larger sense of avoiding what he considered to be counterproductive conflict. Thus it was Morgan who accused fellow TVA Board members, David E. Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan, of political favortism in the appointment of personnel. Although never able to prove his accusations, he elevated it to a policy concern equal to the agency's efforts in power production, erosion control and reforestation - arguing that the agency could not afford the appearance of patronage even if that appearance was invisible to everyone but himself. It was also Morgan who shied away from direct confrontation with the private power companies - he preferred instead a mutually agreeable compromise. The zealousness with which Morgan pursued these positions soured his relationships with other Board members and eventually led to his dismissal by Roosevelt in 1937. Demonstration, not confrontation, was Morgan's preferred method of reform - an approach he applied to all facets of TVA's activities, from power policy to community development. But in pursuing this principle with the moral fervor of a utopian, he ironically generated one of the most bitter public exchanges in the annals of government administration in the United States.

Morgan's tactics paralleled an approach to reform outlined by Krueckeberg in his description of the historical forces leading to the creation of Norris. Beyond these reformists principles, those directly responsible for the plan of Norris were tied by training and experience to the 20th century American garden city movement. Earle S. Draper, who headed TVA's Division of Land Planning and Housing, first worked under John Nolen in designing the planned community of Kingsport, Tennessee, and later built a series of milltowns and wealthy subdivisions throughout the southeast. His designs all bore the imprint of garden city principles. Tracy Auger, Norris' chief town planner, was a member of the RPAA and was well-versed in garden city planning concepts; and TVA regional planner Brenton MacKayre, also a member of the RPAA, envisioned Norris as a first step in regionwide community development

system based on the ideas of Howard. Thus Morgan's abstract reform principles merged with the tangible design concepts of garden city practioners to produce a unique integration of theory and practice. Norris was a demonstration in garden city principles, but equally important it was also a demonstration in social reform. A new 'community' was being built in the fullest sense of the word - both as a physical and social construct which might be used as a building block for a new pattern of regional development.

The long-term investment in intellectual capital that informed the Norris experiment was tempered by short-term considerations, a factor demonstrated by Thomas McCraw of Harvard University in the second conference presentation. Norris was more than a product of longstanding reform and planning principle; it was a town built to house construction workers and the administrative staff for Norris Dam, TVA's first massive public work project. As Auger put it, "new housing was vital to the job". Consequently, planning for the town never fell victim to leisurely academic discussions. With an influx of 2,100 workers into a remote, mountainous section of east Tennessee and with a tentative three-year schedule to complete the dam, the pace of the construction in Norris often outstripped preconceived elements of design. A townsite was chosen in July 1933, just two months after the agency's creation; detailed land surveys were constructed in August; groundbreaking took place in October; housing construction began in January 1934; and the first dwellings were ready for occupancy in May. By October 1934, the town of Norris consisted of 150 houses and eight campus-like dormitories and within two years after groundbreaking there were 325 houses (a size not much different from today). This frantic building pace stood in sharp contrast to the studious, idealistic principles upon which the town was conceived. Auger conceded that the "demand for plans, plans, plans, that construction might go unhindered," made it impossible to follow "textbook procedures of planning." He admitted that "whole streets were peopled before full plans were drawn for the community for which they formed a part."

Despite inevitable compromises, Norris' link to TVA's river development program accelerated the process from idea to blueprint to reality. Previous garden city experiments conducted by those responsible for the Norris design assured that the town would abide by Howard's general principles; TVA's wide-ranging multiresource activities in eastern Tennessee - which required an increase in housing - guaranteed that the town would be built. The housing crisis made Norris, in one sense, a construction camp; but century-old concepts about the nature of community transformed that camp into a uniquely planned town imbued with garden city ideas.

McCraw also conveyed another important aspect of the immediate environment which nurtured the Norris experiment. There was sense of pride and purpose in the construction of the town matched by a level of commitment existing throughout the entire agency. It was an attitude promoted by Franklin D. Roosevelt who took a keen interest in TVA and the town of Norris. (In fact, FDR was the first public official to broaden proposed legislation for public ownership and management of the power and nitrate facilities in Muscle Shoals, Alabama, into a regionwide resource development program for the entire Tennessee River Basin.) McCraw's father, who was employed by TVA, fondly remembers looking up from fieldwork to encounter Eleanor Roosevelt, who had come to Norris to see this town planning experiment. Norris was important to policymakers and this attitude enchanced the sense of commitment among the workforce. They were not just building a town; but an idea. Thus the garden city concept had in some ways come full cycle. Whereas before the idea shaped the community, the community was now giving life to the idea. It was this opportunity which enabled TVA to attract the Nation's foremost planners - Draper, Augur, and MacKaye. But what was happening to town planning in TVA was not an isolated phenomenon. Because of its dynamic quality and experimental nature (not to mention the job crunch created by the Depression), the agency attracted some of the Nation's foremost experts in engineering, forestry, agriculture,

and (as former TVA director of labor relations, Ted Schultz, pointed out in the conference) in personnel and management. While the agency was building a new town at Norris, it was encouraging the creation of labor unions within its own organization at a time when unions were an anathma in the South and an anomaly in the public sector.

The economic trauma of the Great Depression demanded action and Franklin D. Roosevelt, not one to be confined by ideology, encouraged experimentation. When conservative principles shaped the experiment, agencies like the National Recovery Administration were created; when progressive social principles shaped the experiment, agencies like TVA were born, and when planners like Draper and Auger were given design responsibility a unique planned community like Norris was constructed. Thus a century of intellectual discussion joined with the immediacy of an economic crisis and the need for action to create a rare moment in American history. In the early 1930s a great investment in intellectual capital was cashed in at a time of unprecedented fludity in public policy. The payoff was the passage of the TVA Act and the development of Norris.

In introductory remarks preceding the McCraw and Krueckeberg presentations, Landrum Bolling (who began his career with TVA in 1933 as a file clerk and who is currently a professor of diplomacy at George Washington University) declared that with a population of only 1300. Norris is a place which proves that "small can be beautiful". Norris, he went on, is a "symbol of a human-scale community" which demonstrates that vitality and fulfillment need not be a function of town size. Bolling's 1983 observations were strikingly similar to those made by Earle S. Draper 50 years ago. Draper declared that the town was intended to be 'a rural village'. Or, as Tracy Auger asserted, Norris should be planned 'not as a small beginning or a great future city, but a small town content to remain small'. A 1930s vision of

community development based on ideas of self-containment and limited growth resurfaced at the conference, and the Norris idea once again emerged as an antidote to metropolitan gigantism and shapeless surburban sprawl.

Fifty years of history have not altered Norris' aesthetic and social appeal. But the intellectual and political context which nurtured the town plan and construction have changed enormously. First, post-World War II planners shifted their analytical focus from historical- and cultural-based regional plans (most clearly expressed in a definition of region as a watershed) to abstract regional models based on scientific principles which minimize the importance of cultural heritage. Thus the regional plan has moved from the watershed to the computer console. Recently there has been renewed concern for the value of territoriality in the planning process, ironically expressed by planners like John Friedmann, who has been a principal architect of the functional, regional science methodology prevalent in the 1950s and 1960s. But at worst the intellectual capital which gave rise to the planning of Norris and the creation of TVA has been eclipsed by another school of thought. At best, these two theories of regional development coexist in an unsettled academic environment associated with planners who hope to graft the cultural concerns of one approach upon the scientific techniques of the other. If long-term investments in planning theories have been shaken over the past decades, the political climate which sustained the creation and development of Norris had undergone dramatic changes. Advocates of the garden city movement were always a minority speaking out against the overwhelming force of metropolitanization. But when they spoke their analysis of planning problems and prospects were derived from a shared vision. The same cannot be said of the diverse movement which now supports and values small, relatively self-contained communities. In a sense, 1930 advocates valued the importance of balanced integration – integration between the natural and built environment, young and old, rich and poor, laborers and professionals. They may not have achieved their goal (Norris, as an enclave for TVA engineers and

administrators, certainly did not) but the idea sparked their plans. In the 1980s, advocates of small communities are often impelled to action by a desire for separation. Thus 50 years has not obliterated the vision behind Norris as an appealing aesthetic, but the intellectual and political environment has been so rewoven as to dramatically transform the context in which these communities are developed. Moreover, the negative reaction to gigantism has now extended from community to the size of a political organization. And let us not forget that it was the Federal Government which was responsible for the construction of Norris and the more comprehensive notions of regional development discussed during the TVA's first years. No other level of government could have operated, let alone thought, on such a scale. Just as city planning must be concerned about the relationship of one building to another, regional planning must be concerned about the relationship of one geographical area to another. This requires the active involvement of the Federal Government, an involvement for which there appears scant popular or political support. Thus the first day of the conference, which dealt with the historical roots of Norris, suggested that the planning theories behind the town still found widespread appeal, but it also raised serious questions about the applicability of the Norris experiment in view of the current climate of opinion existing among planners and political officials.

Because of its place in the annals of town and regional planning, Norris, Tennessee, is perhaps more of an historic artifact than most communities. The city has really not changed very much in physical appearance since the 1930's. The amenities with which Earle Draper and others endowed it at its inception have survived and even mellowed. Norris offers an attractive physical environment. But Norris is more than a residual heirloom from the 1930s. It is a living city sharing the contemporary opportunities and problems of the East Tennessee region and the Tennessee Valley which gave it birth. It is also a city very much unlike other cities in East Tennessee for it is an upper middle income, predominantly white, bedroom

community of technical, professional, and other kindred people.

A premise of the conference planners was that the past could perhaps provide a prologue to the future. Out of Norris' history the conference planners hoped might come clues as to what its future could be, and should be, in its second half-century. On the second day of the conference, two speakers, representing the original institutions most responsible for the creation of Norris, the U.S. Congress and the Tennessee Valley Authority, considered the present status and future prospects for community development programs, nationally and in the Valley.

The TVA Board Chairman, Charles H. Dean, saw Norris as a continuing symbol of what other cities and towns in the Tennessee Valley might become - places of full employment, technically skilled employees, and a high quality of life and environment. And, said the Chairman, if government had to become the employer of last resort to achieve full employment, that would not be objectionable, a remarkable statement from a Reagan appointee. Perhaps the social philosophies of the 1930s are going to be recycled along with the newly rediscovered elegance and luxury of Art Deco.

But unlike most Tennessee Valley communities, Norris' problem is not so much achieving full emloyment - it has that - as finding means to support its demand for public service - a demand which is altering as its population becomes increasingly elderly and retired. Some Norris residents at the conference called for the expansion of tax-base rateables - specifically through clean, so-called, high-tech industries - that will-of-the-wisp dream of every community in America with a chamber of commerce.

Certainly, Norris will have to look elsewhere than the federal government for community development assistance. That was the message of the local

Congresswoman, Marilyn Lloyd, who painted a picture of diminishing federal funds for community development programs. Local initiative and entrepreneurship will have to expand to solve local development issues and that is the silver lining, said the Representative. The silver would, it was implied, also have to be provided locally.

Whatever Norris is to become, it was not readily evident either in the tea leaves of historians or the dwindling domestic programs of the politicians and the bureaucrats. Perhaps Norris will just go on mellowing, remaining pretty much the same as it is now – not necessarily a bad fate. A few cities, bypassed by history, have survived unchanged by time. They have been exceptions, but Norris, too, has always been an exceptional city.

DAVID A. JOHNSON
University of Tennessee.

PROFESSOR SIR NIKOLAUS PEVSNER

Sir Nikolaus Pevsner died in August 1983. The Times obituary of 19 August described him as an art historian and chronicler of buildings in England.

Nikolaus Pevsner was born into a well-to-do commercial family in Leipzig in 1902. In the characteristically German fashion of the period he undertook a specialised study of the history of art concentrating on the history of architecture. His main teacher was Wilhelm Pinder, earlier known for his speculative analysis of the space of medieval churches, and later for his chauvinistic investigations of the Germanness of art. Atypical for a German art historian of his times, Pevsner, by the late 1920s, developed a strong interest in contemporary design and architecture, which included

a championship of Modern Movement, i.e. Werkbund and late Bauhaus design, as happened in a similar way with one of his contemporaries, the Swiss art historian Siefried Giedion. The link of art historical research and proselytism seemed a logical one, in spite of the general development towards a' wertfrei'· art history, an 'objective' history. The passionate defence of the Modern Movement was naturally increased by the way the Nazis treated its supporters and, to a lesser extent, by the indifference encountered by its supporters in their newly adopted Anglo-Saxon countries. On balance, the greatest effect and influence of Pevsner's teaching and activities probably comes under this heading : the spread of modern design in Britain after the Second World War, chiefly through his editorship of the Architectural Review.

It is very difficult, however, to decide where Pevsner's greatest successes lay, which of his activities were the most cherished; his never-ending care for his students; his astonishing capacity to adopt new areas of interest without losing touch with the old ones. He could, for instance, be called one of the great Engish art critics of the period; he turned to Victorian architecture, investigating some of its roots and theories, which were diametrically opposed to his cherished Modern Movement. And lastly, there is the staggering magnitude of his antiquarian achievements in the Buildings of England.

It is somewhat surprising, though, that Pevsner never tackled the history of town planning as such – although he must have known the old werkbund slogan, 'Vom Stadtebau zum Sofakissen' – from townplanning to the cushion of the sofa. In this respect his work contrasts vividly with that of Giedion. But this limitation may point to a virtue: there is little in Pevsner's writings that compares with Giedion's combination of extreme Wolfflinianism – i.e. an insistence of pure visual analysis with Hegel's Zeitgeist; those concerned with day-to-day research will be grateful for this lack.

STEFAN METHESIUS
University of East Anglia.

BEFORE THE COMPUTER

Planners' interest in the computer continues to grow [1]. The latest survey shows that 180 local authorities make use of 230 mainframe and mini-computers, with every county in England and Wales operating one or more machines [2]. Forty-one per cent of planning departments now use computer facilities compared with only 1.5% a decade ago [3]. Such an efflorescense of computing power might lead the unwary to suppose that a large data-handling gap separates the pre-computer era from the present. And it might also be thought that the arrival of machines in the middle and late 1960s was an absolute novelty to planners. In fact, neither of these assumptions would be correct.

Hidden from history by the immense prestige of the electronic computer is its humble predecessor, the punched card machine. In the 1940s and '50s, punched card installations in local and central government were the vital bridging technology between manual and electronic calculation. They occupied the place in our concerns which computers now fill, and set the terms on which electronic computation was to be accommodated in plan-making. This article describes some of the administrative and technical pressures behind the introduction of machines into offices. It also shows how planners applied machines to plan- work, and looks at the implications of a higher technical content for the form of the planning process. Examples of planning practice are drawn from current research into the origins of the new planning processes of the 1960s [4].

PUNCHED CARD TECHNOLOGY

The purpose of a punched card machine suite was to solve specified arithmetic problems by mechanical or electro-mechanical means. The four machines typical of all punched card installations were invented in the 1880s by Dr Herman Hollerith, a young statistician working for the US Census Bureau [5]. They consisted of a card punch, a sorter, a calculator and a tabulator. In a sequence of operations, data were coded onto a standard card to make it machine-readable, and the cards were passed through and manipulated by the machines to simulate a calculation (Hollerith's first devices could only add). The final results were posted up on a tabulator (originally an array of dials from which readings could be taken, but later

converted into a printer). The machine suite was first tested by Hollerith on sample data from Baltimore in 1887 [6], and went on to beat rival systems in a competition to process the results of the 1890 US Census.

The punched card contributed to office mechanization both in the service of government census bodies, and in accountancy for private and public corporations. British Tabulating Machines (established in 1907) won the contract for the 1911 Census, and printed 50 million cards for the occasion. BTM also supplied machines to Vickers of Sheffield for purposes of wage calculation. The Accounting and Tabulating Machine Corporation supplied an installation to Prudential Assurance in London for its actuarial and accounting work. The 'Pru' purchased ATM's UK subsidiary in 1919 so it could market to the Empire. In short, wherever there were routine clerical operations and a large, steady workflow, the punched card made its appearance [7].

MACHINES IN GOVERNMENT

Official interest in punched card equipment went in two phases. The first was the sporadic purchase and employment of machines by local authorities in the inter-war period. The second was the review and planned expansion of office machinery from the centre, during and after the Second World War.

Coventry was one of the first local authorities to use punched cards. The City Treasurer, Sydney Larkin, installed Powers punchers, sorters and tabulators in the early 1920s to handle his department's calculations of wages, stores and costs. Norwich had machines in its City Engineers Department from the '20s; Kingston-upon-Hull used punched cards for general and water rates after 1934; the Transport Department of Manchester generated bus mileage and other statistics from cards, and installed machines in the Treasurer's Department in 1946; and Cardiff was the first authority in Wales to use punched cards in 1941, for costing the repairs of war damage. It seems that punched card technology generally entered local government via the Treasurer's Department. But once installed, the machines were extended from internal accounting of wages and materials to the management of transactions connected with the payment of rates and the production of service information.

The situation went unreviewed by central government until the War. The rapid expansion of the war state – 'that great engine of bureaucratisation and centralization' [8] – found that section of the Treasury responsible for administration quite unprepared for the tasks on hand. The Select Committee on National Expenditure condemned the inter-war Treasury's 'almost complete failure to foster the systematic study of organisation as applied to Government Departments' [9]. The Treasury's Investigating Section, which supplied office appliances to government departments and advised them on methods, was promptly expanded to meet these criticisms. It grew from two officers at the outbreak of war to 46 in June 1942. After consultation with a panel of businessmen led by Mr Reid Young, Chairman of Vickers, the name of the Section was changed to Organisation and Methods, and its officers given a more wide-ranging brief. On a typical assignment to a government department, the O and M team drew up charts of organisation and structure; plotted chains of command and workflow; measured the pace and intensity of office work; and made recommendations on management, staffing and technique. By 1947 the O and M Division employed 224 staff, and thanks to its Office Machine Branch could boast that the Civil Service was now more highly mechanised than its administrative equivalent in industry and commerce [10]. The Select Committee on Estimates praised the 'engineering and analytical approach of Organisation and Methods', which it agreed was the necessary instrument for 'planning the structure and machinery of government' [11].

By the late 1940s, then, a novel discourse had appeared at the centre of the British state. It defined administration as a work process, the better to rationalize and mechanize it. At the same time, O and M brought into being a first generation of specialists in officework, whose career and mission was to mutate the public office towards finer and finer control of its operations [12]. The vocabulary, methods and personnel of O and M came to form so many historical conditions of existence of 'rational' government.

O AND M IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Organisation and Methods began life in the Treasury and would have remained there, if the Local Government Manpower Committee had not pressed for its extension into municipal and county administration. In 1952, Coventry City Council, at the behest of its Town Clerk and Chief Officers,

persuaded the Treasury to let its O and M Division make an exemplary study of the corporation's functioning. As a result, 11 officers spent six man-years examining the authority, producing in 1953 some 32 reports covering the 19 departments and their common services [13]. Amongst numerous other recommendations, the O and M team confirmed the savings to be made by modernisation of the Treasurer's punched card equipment. Needing little prompting, the City Treasurer, Dr A.H. Marshall, asked for and received the Council's permission to purchase an electronic computer. An IBM 626 was delivered in 1954 [14]. Marshall argued that every Department in the authority should acquire a specialist 'versed in the mighty potentialities of the machine, thoroughly familiar with local needs, and charged with the duty of ensuring that the computer is made to serve the authority and its departments to the limit of its capacity' [15]. When the computer and scientific staff entered local government, therefore, they appeared on a ground prepared by the punched card machines and addressing problems already partly solved by pre-electronic means.

The Coventry experiment had a significant effect on other local authorities. Whereas in 1954 only 12 authorities (outside London) had full-time O and M officers on their staff, by 1965 this number had increasd to 62, representing two-thirds of all counties and one half of county boroughs [16].

Meanwhile, local authorities increasingly replaced manual routines with electro-mechanical and electronic processing, harnessing the punched card to the first primitive computers. In drawing up flowcharts and consulting with systems analysts, many local authorities were forced – perhaps for the first time in their corporate existence – to examine the form and content of their administration. This involved them in the acquisition of a managerial perspective, a battery of tests and techniques, a knowledge of 'best practice' and an appreciation of the computer [17]. In short, the discourse on O and M brought a hitherto formless zone of office work within the reach of the administrator and accountant, by multiplying the objects and processes which could be spoken of. Simultaneously, the new methods of processing information through the office added an extra field of choice to the work of individual government departments. How did town planners respond to the challenge? More precisely, which were the first zones of the planning office to be defined as a work process, to be rationalised and mechanised?

During the 1950s planners made only sporadic use of punched card techniques. When machines were employed it was for the limited purpose of sorting and tabulating data; and the results were destined strictly for the Report of Survey or ministerial returns. Nevertheless, most applications were studiously written up, and circulated for comment in the professional journals. By about 1960, punched card analysis had won a place in the planning survey, and was even regarded as 'best practice' when it came to certain data-handling problems. Four examples may be cited of how planners applied the technology, and evaluated its usefulness [18].

The earliest British applications would appear to come from Portsmouth in the late 1940s, when the Max Lock Group was preparing a plan for the district. A young Frank Layfield was responsible for a population and housing survey. 'In order to save time and money the information on these forms was then transferred to Hollerith cards for electrical tabulation' [19]. Analyses were produced of overcrowding, under-occupancy and blight (on a six factor index). Faster and more accurate results than from manual sorting were reported, as well as a need for less staff (who could be augmented by temporary unskilled workers).

Also on the South Coast reference should be made to the many and varied activities of Leslie Jay, County Planning Officer for East Sussex. Between 1952 and 1955 he organised a comprehensive rural survey to gather demographic, economic, land use, social and other data. As part of a journey-to-work study for the county, the survey material was punched on cards and needle sorted by hand [20]. Over the next five years the survey was extended to the county towns, and in one case employment data for three towns were analysed by Hollerith machines [21]. By this time, Jay had compiled manuals on surveying, coding and analysis to guide his staff in the machine processing of data. He calculated that by using punched cards, there was a 50% saving in man-hours over conventional processing.

A third example comes from Middlesex. T.E. Parry and Arthur Morris devised a method (akin to double-entry book-keeping) of recording land use changes, that would provide them with an up-to-date statistical base for Plan review and other purposes [22]. Morris subsequently transferred the data to

punched cards - albeit edge-clipped cards rather than the 80 column kind. A file of site-specific cards (he reckoned 50,000 would cover the county) removed the need for repetitive large-scale surveys because single cards could be updated as changes occurred. Furthermore, statistics on land parcel aggregates could be produced in 'almost limitless combinations and permutations' [23]. About 15% more labour was required in measurement and tabulation than with a manual system, but data retrieval and the generation of totals and sub-totals were much easier and simpler.

Finally, there is the case of London. The land use surveys on which the 1951 LCC Development Plan was based produced an alarming number of forms, which had to be individually revised or sub-divided as use changes were notified. When the forms had reached 175,000, the opportunity of the Plan Review was taken to transfer all the records to punched cards. A second land use survey was undertaken in 1957, and this time the location and characteristics of the land parcels were numerically coded on the survey record. The two files were then merged, and periodically updated after 1957 to take account of zoning, programming and further land use alterations. Tabulations from this file were incorporated in the 1960 Plan Review, as well as in more detailed statistical analyses of particular planning problems, e.g. car parking and office policy. When the County purchased an IBM 650 computer in the early '60s, all the land records were transferred again from cards to magnetic tape. This opened the way to longer site records and to more extensive correlation and selection of individual items on those records [24].

CONCLUSIONS

Several levels of explanation can be adopted in analysing the processes by which local government acquired and employed punched card technology for planning purposes.

Firstly, office administration of the 1940s and '50s in both the public and private sectors was submitted to a discourse on rational, economic organis- ation. O and M used financial accounting as its point of entry into government. It deposited a layer of 'organizers' and 'reformers', and swiftly accumulated a pool of techniques, available to all service departments.

Secondly, a new technical division of labour was imposed upon the planning office. Invited by their Treasurer and O and M officer to make use of punched card installations, and required by the Minister to supply voluminous pre-plan information, planning chiefs had no choice but to extend the frontiers of their office to include the machine accounting section of the authority. Thus augmenting their staff, equipment, workload and timetable, the planners came to recognise the activity of data-processing as both a proper stage in plan-making and a complex labour-process in its own right.

As a third factor, the use of machines had an upstream effect on the kinds of material that could now be accepted for processing. The survey lost its aesthetic aspect and was entrusted to junior officers armed wih coding systems and a book of rules [25]. In certain areas, personally acquired (and traditionally valued) knowledge became redundant because it was not machine-compatible. The general effect of machinery was to disaggregate and homogenise the components of knowledge, until ideally one was left with an endless and banal stream of digits. The attacks on, and defences of, craftsmanship in the mid-'60s were founded on this elementary process.

Finally, with the shift in the late '50s from plan-making to plan-reviewing, there was a greater willingness to plan on the basis of records, and therefore to define planning in relation to information. In 1961, an American planner, Robert McCarger, was happy to describe the planning office as 'a configuration of humans and devices organised to solve problems by processing information. In short it can be regarded as an information system' [26]. This was also, in a less theorised way, a British preoccupation. MHLG criticised the lack of standardisation and comparability in survey information, and proposed a more rigorous statistical discourse [27].

John James told a Summer School in 1955 how, as the planning system developed, plans and surveys would accumulate one upon the other, with therefore the need to substitute a 'kinetic' for a 'synoptic' view of information [28]. In short, the scene was set for computer-aided, information-based, land-use planning of a kind now familiar to us today.

Many questions remain to be answered, of both an empirical and theoretical nature. For the moment it is enough to have recovered an obscure moment in the pre-electronic era of town planning. Certain dimensions of planning practice will remain inexplicable unless reference is made to transformations in the planning office itself [29].

MARK LONG
Department of Civic Design
University of Liverpool

References

1. The theme issue Computers in planning **The Planner**, 68, July/August, 1982, pp 100-26; Chuck Chulvick, 'Micros and local authority information systems', **BURISA**, 47, February, 1981, pp 3-7.

2. K.S. Bardon and N. Stothers (1982) **Computer use in local authority planning departments. Some initial findings**. Department of Planning and Landscape, City of Birmingham Polytechnic. The authors also note the increasing popularity of microcomputers, which are valued by the smaller or more remote planning departments for their compactness, cheapness and text-handling capability.

3. Richard Baxter, Computers in local authorities, **The Planner**, 58, June, 1972, pp 257-8.

4. An introduction to punched-card equipment and its applications **Data Processing**, 3, January-March, 1961, pp 44-59; Robert G. Van Ness (1962) **Principles of punched card data processing**. The Business Press, Elmhurst, Illinois; Francis B. Martin, Punched card equipment, pp 13-21 in R. D. Duke (ed) (1961) **Automatic data processing. Its application to urban planning**. Michigan State University, East Lansing.

5. Herman H. Goldstine (1972) **The computer from Pascal to Von Neumann**. Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp 65-71; Herman Hollerith (1889) An electric tabulating system, pp 133-43, in Brian Randell (ed) (1982 edn) **The origins of digital computers. Selected papers**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

6. Processing land parcel data amongst others: Martin, Punched card equipment, p 13.

7. Cf Harry Braverman on the development of clerical labour this century (1974) **Labour and monopoly capital**, Monthly Review Press, New York, pp 293-374; Jane Barker and Hazel Downing, Word processing and the transformations of the patriarchal relations of control in the office, **Capital and Class**, 10, 1980, pp 64-69.

8. Alan Booth, The Second World War and the origins of modern regional policy, **Economy and Society**, 11, 1982, pp 1-21.

9. Select Committee on National Expenditure (1942), **Organisation and control of the Civil Service**, 16th Report, HMSO, London, p.18.

10. Organisation and Methods Division (1947) **Methods and appliances in government offices**, H.M. Treasury, HMSO, London.

11. Select Committee on Estimates (1947). **Organisation and Methods and its effect on the staffing of government departments**. 5th Report. HMSO. London.

12. See e.g. Organisation and Methods Division (1954) **The practice of O and M**. H.M. Treasury. HMSO. London.

13. L.G.S. Mason. The City of Coventry: a review by Treasury O and M Division. **O and M Bulletin**. 9. April. 1954. pp 5-11; J.E. Dunkley. The City of Coventry: review of financial control and accounting. **O and M Bulletin**. 9. June. 1954. pp 9-18; Charles Barratt. Coventry and Organisation and Methods. **Public Administration**. Spring. 1954. pp 52-94.

14. Coventry was the first local authority in Britain to install an electronic computer. The honour has been erroneously attributed to Norwich (whose Elliott 400 series machine was delivered in 1957) in e.g. C.W. Mallison. The use of computers in local government in Britain. **Studies in Comparative Local Government**. 2. Winter. 1968. pp 18-24; and David Hughes. Computers and the Census. in Ian Twinn (ed) (1980) **The use of computers in town planning**. Planning Conference Paper 13. Department of Town Planning. Polytechnic of the South Bank. London.

15. A.H. Marshall. Brave new world. **Accountancy**. LXV. 1954. pp 92-3.

16. Raymond Nottage. Organisation and Methods in the smaller public authority. **Public Administration**. Summer. 1954. pp 143-64; M. Harrison and A. Norton (1967) **Local government administration in England and Wales**. Vol.5. Committee on the management of local government. HMSO. London. p 403.

17. James W. Foster. O and M work in local government. **O and M Bulletin**. 14. December. 1959. pp 243-50; British Productivity Council (1962) **Work study and O and M in local government**. London.

18. References for three further examples not given in the text: (i) Birmingham. 1956 – Interview with Peter Wood (4 May 1983). transcript deposited in History of Planning Methodology Archive. University of Reading. (ii) Glasgow. 1957 – Town Planning Institute (1961). **Planning Research**. London. p 25. (iii) Devon. 1958 – J.D. Wallis. Punched card analysis techniques. **JTPI**. XLIV. July-August. 1958. p 227.

19. Frank Layfield. A survey of housing and population. **JTPI**. XXXIV. May. 1950. p 185.

20. Leslie Jay. A survey of rural settlements in East Sussex. The journey to work. in European Society for Rural Sociology (1958) **Rural migration**. Papers and Discussions. Bonn, West Germany.